



JYOTI BHAI MUNSHI LIBRARY

NAINI TAL

ज्योति बाई मुन्शी पुस्तकालय
नैनीताल

Class No. 9.54.02

Date No. S.H. 38. R

1936

THE RELIGIOUS POLICY
OF THE
MUGHAL EMPERORS

By the same author

A Bibliography of Mughal India (1526-1707).

Maharana Pratap.

Organization of Public Services in Mughal India.

Assessment and Collection of the Land Revenue under
Akbar.

Conversion and Reconversion to Hinduism during the
Muslim Period.

THE
RELIGIOUS POLICY
OF THE
MUGHAL EMPERORS

BY

SRI RAM SHARMA

Professor of History, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1940

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

AMEN HOUSE, LONDON, EC 4


EDINBURGH GLASGOW MELBOURNE

NEW YORK TORONTO CAPETOWN

BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS

HUMPHREY MILFORD

PUBLISHER TO THE
UNIVERSITY



First published 1940

1956

Printed in India by P. Knight
at the Baptist Mission Press, 41A, Lower Circular Road, Calcutta

To

SIR JADUNATH SARKAR, Kt., C.I.E., M.A., D.Litt.

.

PREFACE

In the following pages a systematic attempt has been made to study the religious policy of the Mughal emperors from the original records of their reign. I have tried to approach the subject with sympathy and understanding. If I pass judgement, it is because no study of the subject would have been complete without doing so.

I am grateful to the authorities of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Khuda Bakash Oriental Public Library, Bankipur, the Muslim University, Aligarh, the Punjab Public Library, Lahore, the Punjab University, Lahore, and the Imperial Record Office, Delhi, for their kindness in allowing me to use the manuscripts and printed materials in their possession. I am thankful to M. M. Rai Bahadur Pt Gori Shankar Ojha who very kindly allowed me access to all his valuable collections of books, manuscripts and advance copies of some of his works. Sir Jadunath Sarkar placed at my disposal his unique collection of manuscripts and printed works on the period and gave me every facility for carrying on my work. To Their Highnesses, the Maharana of Udaipur, the Nawab of Rampur, the Maharaja of Jodhpur, the Raja of Banera, and the Maharaja of Bikaner, I am grateful for their kind permission to examine relevant historical material in their possession.

I have not given any detailed description of the books and manuscripts listed in the Bibliography as I have already described most of them in my *A Bibliography of Mughal India*.

SRI RAM SHARMA

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	BĀBUR AND HUMAYŪN	1

Indian government under the Sultānate—Distinction between the status of the Hindus and the Muslims: the *jizya*—Pilgrimage tax—Public religious worship—Public services—Sumptuary laws—Laws of blasphemy—Apostacy—Occasional persecutions—Hindus under the Sultānate—Bābur's religious policy—Humāyūn—Shor Shāh and the Hindus—Notes.

II.	AKBAR AND THE FOUNDATION OF A NEW ORDER	15
-----	---	----

His accession—The contemporary atmosphere—Akbar's heritage—The *jizya*—Public worship—Cultural contacts—Conversions to other religions—Public services—Respect for Hindu sentiments—Social reforms—Some administrative measures—Court ceremonies—The Infallibility Decree—Marriage and religion—The alleged persecution of the Muslims—His religious beliefs—The *Dīn-i-Ilāhī*—His critics—His achievements—Notes—Appendix: Hindu mansabdārs of Akbar.

III.	JAHĀNGĪR	70
------	----------	----

His accession—Conversion to Islam—Places of worship—Pilgrimages—Relations with Christians—Jahāngir and the Sikhs—Jahāngir and the Jains—Muslim heretics—Fairs and festivals—Religious discussions—Hindus in the public services—Social evils—Court ceremonies—Slaughter of animals—Cultural contacts—Jahāngir and Islam—Conclusion—Notes.

IV.	SHĀH JAHĀN	94
-----	------------	----

His accession—Court ceremonies—Public services—Pilgrimage tax—Religious places of non-Muslims—Conversions to other religions—Conversions to Islam—Blasphemy—Sumptuary laws—Cultural contacts—Conclusion—Notes.

Chapter	Page
V. AURANGZEB THE PURITAN	..118

Court ceremonies—Moral regulations—Puritanic restrictions—Hindus in the public services—Destruction of Hindu temples—Punitive regulations against the Hindus—Imposition and collection of the *jizya*—Hindu converts to Islam—Aurangzeb and the Sikhs—Aurangzeb's failure—Notes—Appendix I, List of mansabdārs—Appendix II, Hindu converts to Islam—Notes—Appendix III, Aurangzeb and the Sikhs.

VI. NATURE OF THE STATE IN MUGHAL INDIA191
--	----	-------

Notes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY203
--------------	----	-------

INDEX209
-------	----	-------

ERRATA

<i>Page</i>		<i>For</i>	<i>Read</i>
13	notes 4, 7 and 9	' <i>Afif</i>	' <i>Afif</i>
	notes 8, 18 and 25	<i>Firishta</i>	<i>Firishta</i>
14	note 26	Do.	Do.
16	line 22	' <i>Abdul Nabi</i>	' <i>Abdun Nabi</i>
61	note 40	<i>Jadrūp</i>	<i>Jadurūp</i>
67	note 193	<i>Haft Aqalim</i>	<i>Haft Aqalim</i>
68	item 8	<i>Bughela</i>	<i>Baghela</i>
92	note 57	<i>Rieu, I</i>	<i>Rieu, I, 337a.</i>
113	line 5	<i>Sunder</i>	<i>Sundar</i>
171	note 33	<i>Muhammad, usaf</i>	<i>Muhammad Usaf,</i>
172	note 53	<i>Ranar</i>	<i>Manucci</i>
176	note 265	<i>Raman, 17.</i>	<i>Sikh tradition</i>
186	line 12	<i>Lufullah</i>	<i>Lutfullah</i>
205	item Hindi, 1	<i>Bakht Māl</i>	<i>Bhakt Māl</i>
207	item, 23	<i>Von Naer</i>	<i>Von Noer</i>

Chapter I

BĀBUR AND HUMĀYŪN

Indian Government under the Sultānate

Under the Sultānate India was held in subjection mainly by the military strength of her rulers. The sultāns and their governors maintained whatever peace they could, collected the land revenue and other taxes, and were otherwise content to leave their subjects alone except where their religious policy was concerned. The Sultānate in India was based on the distinction between its Hindu and Muslim subjects. The Muslims formed the ruling caste. Naturally, the position of the Hindus differed in many respects from that of their Muslim neighbours.

Distinction between the Status of the Hindus and the Muslims : the Jizya

The foremost among these distinctions was the payment of a special tax, the jizya,¹ which had always to be paid personally.² The *Fatawa-i-'Ālamgiri*, a digest of Muslim law prepared under Aurangzeb, but embodying earlier practices, recognizes two types of the jizya.³ One was the payment of an agreed-upon amount by the ruler of a territory or the people thereof. It did not always mean an additional tax, because the amount could well have been paid out of the existing sources of revenue. But in the territories directly under Muslim rulers the jizya was levied on individual tax-payers and its amount had to be individually assessed. Except probably in the earlier days of the Muslim occupation of India, the jizya seems to have been levied directly. Even when new territories were conquered or vassal princes subdued, it was not

customary to make any bargains with them so far as the payment of the jizya was concerned. If the new territory formed a part of the dominions of a Muslim ruler, its inhabitants were expected to pay the jizya according to the rates prevailing elsewhere. If a prince was made feudatory, he was expected to pay a tribute which, though it might have originally included the jizya, was now, only the sign that he had accepted an overlord. His subjects were not expected to pay the jizya which seems to have been levied only in the territories directly under Muslim rulers. At first Brahmans were exempted from the payment of this tax, but in Feroz Shāh's reign it was discovered that it was unreasonable to tax the humble followers of a religion in this fashion and not the leaders who instructed the people. Brahmans therefore were ordered to pay the jizya.⁴ There were times when an exceptionally enlightened monarch, like Zain-ul-Ābādīn, 1420-1470, in Kashmir, remitted the jizya.⁵

As we have discussed below, (the jizya was a very heavy burden to the masses.⁶ But it was not its burden alone which was irksome. It was a badge of inferiority round the necks of the unfaithful reminding them constantly that they formed a subject people under an alien rule.)

Pilgrimage Tax

The jizya was not the only additional tax imposed on the non-Muslims. Most Muslim rulers collected a pilgrimage tax at Hindu places of religious fairs. As we shall presently see, it represented a compromise between the strict injunction of the Muslim law not to tolerate public celebration of non-Islamic practices and the desire of a vast Hindu population to perform their religious rites. Under a pious Muslim king, like Feroz Shāh Tughlaq, this source of profit to the Muslim state from an unholy source was sacrificed to the stricter demands of the Muslim law.⁷

An 'Alā-ud-Din would sometimes improve upon the injunction of his theologians and order a scheme of confiscatory taxation leaving the Hindus only their daily needs. But ordinarily, the Hindus paid the jizya and the pilgrimage tax as additional taxes. The jizya could not be avoided, but the pilgrimage tax need not have been paid by those who attended no fairs. The jizya was a regular annual tax whereas the pilgrimage tax was an occasional one. The jizya was paid only by all non-Muslims living in Muslim territories, whereas the pilgrimage tax was paid by all who visited places of pilgrimage situated in the Muslim states. As various ceremonies connected with deaths in families had usually to be performed at certain holy places, most Hindus paid the tax. Feroz Shāh's order prohibiting these fairs, however, would lead us to believe that the village fairs, which formed so important a part of mediæval economic and religious life and which were held in most places at certain times of the year, were also made a source of income to the state. If that were so the pilgrimage tax would almost be as universally paid as the jizya.

Public Religious Worship

The payment of the jizya and the pilgrimage tax was intended to ensure the free exercise of their religion to the non-Muslims. But this was limited to private worship alone. Public worship of Hindu idols was forbidden. It is difficult to say definitely how far this injunction was enforced and obeyed. In villages, where there were hardly any Muslims, it would have always been possible to carry on the worship of the village gods as before. Of course, there might have been chances of trouble if a zealous qāzī in a neighbouring town heard of such 'malpractices'. The Muslim chroniclers record very few cases where the Hindus were punished for open and public worship of their gods, thus offending the eyes and ears of the faithful. This

might either mean that orders were usually obeyed and therefore no cases of defiance are recorded or that though the orders were disobeyed, it was only under pious kings like Feroz Shāh, that their defiance was punished. It would be safer to hold that mainly in the important towns and cities, where Muslim officials usually resided, some attempt at the enforcement of the law against Hindu worship must have been made. How often this led to clashes we have no means of judging.

This, naturally, implied denial of any extension of the existing facilities for such worship. Thus it was held that the Hindus should not be allowed to build new public temples or to repair old ones. Again, it is difficult to decide how far this was insisted upon in all parts of Muslim territories. Perhaps again, only in big cities where Muslim officers were present and where a considerable number of Muslims lived, the building of new public temples was strictly prohibited. It should be borne in mind, however, that this did not mean denial of religious worship. Oftener than not, the houses of the well-to-do Hindus contained temples of sorts where they, as well as their humbler brethren, could worship their gods. Public temples mainly existed in places which were sanctified by centuries of religious traditions. Such new places were not likely to appear in the Muslim period. Hinduism at this time had become an individual religion where opportunities for corporate public worship were not many. Of course cases of public temples being destroyed or desecrated at the time of the fresh conquest of a territory—as witness Feroz Shāh Tughlaq's desecration of the temples at Kangra,⁸ and Jagannath Puri⁹—stand in a class by themselves and were taken as a sign and a proclamation of the Muslim conquest of non-Muslim territories. The restriction on the building of new temples was interpreted as a restriction, if not the denial, of already existing opportunities for public

worship. Sometimes a particularly pious Muslim king, like Sikandar Lodī, would have a fit of religiosity and desecrate or destroy even existing temples¹⁰ in peaceful times. Religious festivals like the Holi or the Dīpāvalī, raised problems which might sometimes have proved obnoxious to the more orthodox among the Muslim rulers. The Muslim chroniclers, however, are mostly silent on these questions and as we have no other original records of the period, we have to be content with their accounts.

Public Services

The third distinction between the Hindus and the Muslims appeared in the public services. Revenue records were usually kept in Hindi except probably at the headquarters. This implied the employment of a large number of Hindus in the revenue department. Of these many were paid, not by the state, but by the cultivators themselves.¹¹ It would not be, therefore, right to consider them public servants; they were servants of the community. The lowest state officer in the revenue department seems to have been the officer-in-charge of a parganah and it is extremely doubtful whether Hindus were ever employed in large numbers in this or other higher offices. Ordinarily, it would be safe to assert, the Hindus were excluded from all except the lowest posts in the state. On the military side, it was customary at one time to employ Hindu soldiers. The Ghaznavids had contingents of Hindu troops under them. There is no reason to believe that the practice completely disappeared under the Sultānate. We have, however, to remember that pre-Mughal Muslim dynasties in India did not last very long. Three centuries saw the rise and fall of five dynasties. Thus every dynasty had to employ only such soldiers and commanders as commanded its confidence. This would, sometimes, restrict their choice even to particular branches of Muslims. It is safe to hold, however, that Hindus were

usually excluded from all high offices and were employed otherwise only when their employment was unavoidable.

Sumptuary Laws

The fourth distinction existed in the sumptuary laws that were sometimes enforced. As the *Fatāwa-i-‘Ālamgīrī* declares,¹² the Hindus were not to be allowed to look like the Muslims. This, as in the hands of ‘Alā-ud-Dīn, meant the enforcement of certain restrictions. The underlying principle was that the Hindus should look humble and should provide no occasion for creating trouble for their Muslim rulers. ‘Alā-ud-Dīn forbade Hindus to wear rich dresses, ride horses, and drive in carriages, and palanquins. But these orders clearly sound exceptional. Ghiās-ud-Dīn Tughlaq very nearly did the same. Sometimes the Hindus might be asked to wear distinguishing marks on their new dresses, so that they might not be mistaken for Muslims.

These restrictions, when and where enforced, must have been confined to the cities where alone there was any danger of the Hindus emulating the Muslims in their dress and ways of living. In the villages where the Muslim population was small, the Hindus were probably not subject to these restrictions.

Law of Blasphemy

There were also laws against blasphemy.¹³ The unreasonable extent to which these could sometimes be carried is well illustrated by the fate of a Brahman who was beheaded under Sikandar Lodi for maintaining that Hinduism and Islam were both true.¹⁴

Apostacy

Conversion of Muslims to Hinduism or the reconversion of Hindu converts to Islam was not usually permitted. Sometimes there were exceptionally tolerant rulers, like

Zain-ul-‘Ābadin in Kashmir, who were prepared to allow all Hindu converts to Islam to return, if they wished, to their original faith. But this tolerant attitude was so exceptional that a story had to be invented proving him to be a Hindu recluse who had projected his own soul into the dead body of the king on his death-bed.¹⁵ Usually this prohibition must have been strictly enforced as it would have been considered highly objectionable in a Muslim king to encourage or tolerate apostacy which was a capital offence.

Occasional Persecutions

Under some Muslim rulers there were series of fierce persecutions. Forced conversion to Islam took place, sometimes in thousands, as it did under Sikandar Butshikan of Kashmir. Those who defied their fanatic persecutors were slain or had to seek safety in suicide.¹⁶ Jalāl-ud-Din of Bengal (1414 to 1430), a convert himself, with a new convert's zeal, forcibly converted hundreds of his Hindu subjects and persecuted the rest.¹⁷ Most of the Tughlaqs possessed a persecuting strain and Sikandar Lodi suffered from the same defect.¹⁸ It is consoling to find, however, that very few Muslim rulers tried to play the part of fanatical persecutors.

Hindus under the Sultānate

This seems to be a formidable count. But we have to remember that all these manifestations of religiosity were not always to be found together. Generally the Muslim rulers were content if the Hindus paid the jizya and the pilgrimage tax and did not make any attempt to force their wealth or their beliefs on the notice of their Muslim rulers. Of course, the Hindus were not usually allowed to make converts. They were certainly denied any share in the higher appointments in the state but

they held the monopoly of many petty offices in the revenue and accounts departments. Secondly we have to remember that we are dealing with circumstances which were universal in the Middle Ages and for many years after. (The position of the Hindus in India was generally much better than that of many communities in Europe whose faith differed from that of their rulers.) Roman Catholics in Ireland form an instructive parallel. After the Reformation the majority of the population was Roman Catholic under Protestant rulers. Yet their faith was penalized; they were excluded from the higher appointments, and they were aliens in their own country. Nor was the position of the Roman Catholics in Protestant England ever enviable. Even under the prudent Elizabeth, the Roman Catholics could abstain from attendance at Protestant churches by payment of a fine alone, which was parallel to the *jizya* of Muslim India. The position of the Protestants in the Netherlands under Spanish Roman Catholic rulers furnishes an interesting illustration of religious intolerance of these times. The state was long subordinate to the church and it was considered to be a sin if its institutions were not used for the propagation of the state religion. Thus the religious-policy which governed Muslim politics in India till the beginning of the sixteenth century was nothing singular. It was but one example of the intolerance and fanaticism which characterized the period and which continued elsewhere even long after that date. (The only exception was the general policy of the Hindu rulers in India who usually did not interfere with their subjects' religions and did not indulge in persecution.)

Bābur's Religious Policy

(Bābur inherited his policy from the Lodis. Sikandar Lodi's fanaticism must have been still remembered by some of the

officials who continued to serve when Bābur came into power. Bābur was not a great administrator. He was content to govern India in the orthodox fashion. He projected no great changes in the government of the country except the design of a royal road from Agra to Kabul. But the Hindus, he found, occupied no humble position. Rānā Sāṅgā, a Hindu, led a host wherein even Muslim armies were present under disaffected Pathān chiefs and it was his success at the battle of Khanava that enabled him to remain in India as her ruler. These two factors seem to have governed his religious policy. Bābur, the born fighter against heavy odds, knew he was at a great crisis in his life on the eve of his battle against Rānā Sāṅgā. In order to conform strictly to the Muslim law he excluded Muslims from paying stamp duties, thus confining the tax to Hindus alone.¹⁹ He thus not only continued, but increased, the distinction between his Hindu and Muslim subjects in the matter of their financial burdens. One of his officers, Hindu Beg. is said to have converted a Hindu temple at Sambhal into a mosque.²⁰ His sadr, Shaikh Zann, demolished many Hindu temples at Chanderi when he occupied it.²¹ By Bābur's orders, Mir Bāqī destroyed the temple at Ayudhya commemorating Rama's birthplace and built a mosque in its place in 1528-29.²² He destroyed Jain idols at Urva near Gwalior.²³ There is no reason to believe that he used any measures to relax the harshness of the religious policy which he found prevailing.

Recently a document, alleged to be Bābur's will, has been brought to the notice of scholars by the Government of Bhopal (Central India). It was exhibited at one of the meetings of the Indian Historical Records Commission. All the known facts of Bābur's death and Humāyūn's accession to the throne militate against this being genuine. Among other things, the document includes an admonition to Humāyūn to behave liberally towards the Hindus.²⁴

Humāyūn

Bābur's son Humāyūn had not much chance of developing any distinct religious policy of his own. He followed the path of least resistance, the system already in vogue. We have no information whether or not he re-imposed on the Muslims the stamp duty abolished by his father. Probably he did. His religious outlook is well exemplified in his behaviour when he set out against Bahādur Shāh. He would not attack him as long as he was busy against the Rana of Chitor besieging the fort. He sacrificed his own chances of an easy success against Bahādur Shāh rather than interfere in his chances of earning religious merit by defeating an infidel.²⁵ But Humāyūn lived to introduce a partially modified religious policy. Bairam Khān was the most brilliant of his officers who followed him into Persia and back into India. But he was a Shi'a. Now, as we shall see, to the orthodox Sunnis heresy was almost as great a crime as infidelity. But Bairam Khān's faithful services naturally led to a modification of the attitude of the state towards the Shi'as. Humāyūn's stay in Persia also obliged him to show at least some outward respect to Shi'a practices.²⁶ Thus Humāyūn tolerated heresy to a greater extent than his predecessor. One of his *sadr-us-sadūrs* was reputed to be a heretic.²⁷


Sher Shāh and the Hindus

But we must go back a little and study the religious policy of Sher Shāh Sūrī and his successors who supplanted Humāyūn for sixteen long years in the government of India. Sher Shāh was a great ruler: undoubtedly the greatest Muslim ruler before Akbar. We can understand, therefore, the anxiety of his biographer to credit him with a religious policy which he never dreamt of pursuing. *He could not have seen the folly of putting Hinduism under a ban*, as his biographer fondly imagines,²⁸ without abolishing the *jizya*,

the pilgrimage tax and various other signs of the religious hegemony of the faithful. If Muslim chroniclers do not praise him for his religious fanaticism as they do 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Feroz Shāh, or Sikandar Lodī, they simply bring him to the level of the general run of Muslim rulers who had been governing India before his time. The only positive evidence in his favour is the presence of a Hindu commander of doubtful standing and the provision for Hindus in the post-houses which he established. The first does not prove much, as Hindu commanders were found even in the army of Mahmūd of Ghaznī to whom nobody could attribute a liberal religious policy. The second brings us to the question of the nature of these rest-houses. They were essentially a part of a working postal system. The postal runners might well have been Hindus for whom provision was necessary in these rest-houses. There is a separate caste of Hindus which even today works as carriers. It is doubtful whether Muslims in general could have been found willing enough to undertake this humble work. Thus the provision for the Hindus at rest-houses was in the nature of a provision for a class of state servants. Hindu caste rules would not admit of the arrangements described being utilized by high caste Hindus and the places seem clearly to have been utilized, if at all, by Hindus of a lower caste, most probably public servants.

It is wrong to say that Sher Shāh did not destroy a temple or break an imago. His conquest and occupation of Jodhpur was followed by the conversion of the Hindu temple in the fort into a mosque.²⁰ The *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* ascribes his attack on Māldev, Raja of Jodhpur, partly to his religious bigotry and a desire to convert the temples of the Hindus into mosques.³⁰ His treachery towards Pūran Mall was not, as Qanungo tries to assert,³¹ the act of a fanatic religious leader forcing his opinions upon an unwilling king. It had been planned by Sher Shāh beforehand, discussed by him with

1236



his officers and was deliberately done to earn religious merit for exterminating this arch-infidel. Sher Shāh said prayers of thanks after this 'religious' deed. No amount of mere rhetoric can enable us to get over the accounts of the expedition, especially, when we find Sher Shāh, who got ill on the eve of the battle, inviting his officers and confiding to them that ever since his accession he had been anxious, in the cause of his religion, to defeat Pūran Mall. All accounts give this expedition a religious significance which no argument can destroy.³²

Sher Shāh was only a product of his own age as far as his religious policy was concerned. Like Feroz Shāh before him, he combined administrative zeal with religious intolerance. His place in history does not depend upon his initiating a policy of religious toleration or neutrality. He had no more to do with founding a united nation in India, which is yet in the making even today, than any other successful ruler before him.³³

His successor, Salīm Shāh, brought the state under complete subjection to the mullādom. His relations with Shāh Muhammad, a Muslim theologian whom he treated just as Charles X in a later age in France treated the Papal nuncio, prove his subordination to religious leaders. The civil war, that followed Sikandar Shāh's accession, gave Hemū, a mere Hindu shop-keeper, the chance to become 'Ādil Shāh's commander-in-chief and prime minister, thus breaking the religious tradition of intolerance.

This was the system Akbar inherited when he came to the throne in 1556.

NOTES

- 1 When the jizya was first levied by the Prophet in 9 A.H. it included a land tax as well and probably represented the entire financial burden borne by the non-Muslims under his protection. Under the earliest Caliphs the term jizya and kharāj seem to be interchangeable. 'The differentiation in the two forms of taxation implied in jizya (capitation tax) and kharāj (land tax) was not made until the time of the late Umayyads.' A later tradition ascribed this act erroneously to Umar, whose 'convent' was supposed to define the terms granted to those who undertook to pay the jizya. When it was introduced in India by her Muslim conquerors, it had become an additional capitation tax. See Tritton, *The Caliphs and Their non-Muslim Subjects*, 21, and P. K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, 218. For a fourteenth century discussion of the subject, see Muhammad, *Mu'alim-al-Qurba* (ed. R. Levy), 38-45 (Arabic text) and 13-16 (English abstract by the editor).
- 2 See Ch. V below where Aurangzeb's reimposition of the Jizya is discussed.
- 3 Article on Jizya, III, 435 (Urdu translation, Nawal Kishore Press, Lucknow).
- 4 'Afif, 382.
- 5 *Tārīkh-i-Firishta* (Urdu), II, 545.
- 6 See Ch. V.
- 7 'Afif, 388.
- 8 *Firishta*, II, 547.
- 9 'Afif, 379.
- 10 *Haft Aqalim*, f. 127, b, states that he forbade the Hindus bathing at Muttra, desecrated their temples and destroyed their idols.
- 11 *Āin-i-Akbarī* credits Akbar with the abolition of these cesses.
- 12 Vol. III, 442-5. Cf. also *Mu'alim-al-Qurba* as quoted in I.
- 13 Cf. *The Caliphs and Their non-Muslim Subjects and History of the Arabs*, 234.
- 14 *Tārīkh-i-Firishta*, I, 281.
- 15 Cf. Sri Ram Sharma, *Conversion and Reconversion to Hinduism during the Muslim Period*.
- 16 *Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh*, 397.
- 17 *Riyāz-us-Salātin*, 116.
- 18 *Firishta*, 288.
- 19 *Tūzak-i-Bāburī*, II, 281.
- 20 *Archaeological Survey Report*, XII, 26-7.
- 21 *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī*, (MS.), 145.
- 22 Cf. the inscription on the mosque as reproduced in Bannerjee's article *Bābur and the Hindus* (Journal of the U.P. Historical Society, 1936, Allahabad).
- 23 *Memoirs of Bābur*, II, 310.
- 24 *The Twentieth Century*, Allahabad, published a photographic reproduction of this document in its issue for January, 1936.
- 25 *Firishta*, I, 328.

14 THE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF THE MUGHAL EMPERORS

- 26 *Firishta*, I, 362. Cf. *Firishta*, I, 372, where it is related that Kāmīn had doubts about Humāyūn's orthodoxy.
- 27 *Badāyūnī*, I, 392.
- 28 *Qanungo*, 417.
- 29 Local tradition in Jodhpur. Sher Shāh's mosque is still there.
- 30 *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*, 236.
- 31 *Sher Shāh*, 294-6.
- 32 *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*, 229-32. Cf. Abbās, 132-3, Yādgār, 75a, 83a-5a.
- 33 Cf. Sri Ram Sharma, *Sher Shah's Administrative System* (Indian Historical Quarterly, Dec., 1936)

Chapter II

AKBAR AND THE FOUNDATION OF A NEW ORDER

His Accession

Akbar's reign forms the dividing line between the old and the new methods of government which he was to make so successful. When he succeeded his father in 1556, he was only thirteen. The government of the country was administered on his behalf by Bairam Khān. In 1560 Bairam Khān was ousted and a petticoat government established under the auspices of Maham Anagā. By 1562, however, Akbar was able to assert his own power and assume the supreme direction of affairs. From 1562 to 1605 he was his own master consulting whomsoever he liked but shaping his policy mostly according to his own lights. These years saw fundamental changes in the policy of government and enabled Akbar to leave behind him a name which entitles him to a high place among the foremost rulers of mankind.

The Contemporary Atmosphere

When his reign began, it gave no signs of the opening of a new era in the religious policy of the Mughal emperors. Almost his first act of state was to earn religious merit and the title of ghāzī (slayer of infidels) by striking at the disarmed and captive Hemū after his defeat at the second battle of Panipat. Akbar was not asked to whet his sword on Hemū because he was a rebel, but because he was a Hindu. He was to perform not the task of the official executioner, but that of a victorious soldier of Islam. Abu'l Fazl would have us believe that the boy Akbar was wiser than his years

and refused to strike a defenceless enemy.¹ But most other writers are agreed on the fact that he struck at Hemū and earned the title of the Ghāzī thereby.²

This was not an isolated instance of popular feelings. The spirit of the age sanctioned such and even worse practices. Mubārak, a scholar of no mean repute, was persecuted even though he was a Muslim, for holding rather unorthodox views.³ Mīr Habshī was executed for the offence of being a Shi'a;⁴ Khizar Khān met his death on a charge of blasphemy;⁵ there were others as well who shared a similar fate.⁶ As Badāyūnī tells us, it was customary 'to search out and kill heretics', let alone non-Muslims.⁷ The popular attitude towards heretics and non-Muslims can be well understood by several incidents of Akbar's reign itself. In 1569-70 (977 A.H.) Mirzā Muqīm and Mīr Ya'qūb were executed for their religious opinions.⁸ Hemū's father, when captured, was offered his life if he turned Muslim. Even in 1588 when the murderer of a Shi'a was executed, the people of Lahore showed their religious feelings by desecrating the tomb of his victim.⁹ Feelings towards the Hindus could not be restrained—'Abdul Nabī executed a Brahman for blasphemy on the complaint of a qāzī.¹⁰ Husain Khān, the Governor of Lahore, who died in 1575-6 (983 A.H.), made his government famous by ordering that the Hindus should stick patches of different colours on their shoulders, or on the bottom of their sleeves, so that no Muslim might be put to the indignity of showing them honour by mistake. Nor did he allow Hindus to saddle their horses but insisted that they use packsaddles when riding.¹¹ The *Akbar Nāma*, the *Āin-i-Akbarī* and Badāyūnī are all agreed that prior to 1593, some Hindus had been converted to Islam forcibly.¹² When Todar Mall was appointed finance minister, Akbar had to defend this appointment of a Hindu to such a high office by reminding his Muslim critics that they were all utilizing

the services of Hindu accountants in their own households.¹³ When Mān Singh was appointed the leader of the expedition against Maharana Pratāp, the appointment caused some resentment in the Muslim military circles.¹⁴ Badāyūni accompanied Mān Singh in this expedition. On the battlefield he failed to distinguish between the imperial Rajputs and those led by Maharana Pratāp. He asked a Muslim friend nearby who told him that it did not matter. He should shoot indiscriminately; whosoever would be killed would mean one Rajput less and hence Islam would gain.¹⁵ In 1581 some Portuguese captives at Surāt were offered their lives if they would turn Muslims.¹⁶ When Kangra was invaded in 1572-3 (980 A.H.), even though Birbar accompanied the expedition as a joint commander, the umbrella of the goddess was riddled with arrows, 200 cows were killed, and Muslim soldiers threw their shoes full of blood at the walls and the doors of the temple.¹⁷ Salīm, at one time, intended demolishing some of the Hindu temples at Benares but desisted therefrom on Mān Singh's intervention.¹⁸ A Mughal officer, Bāyazid, converted a Hindu temple of Benares into a Muslim school.¹⁹ Some Jain idols are said to have been broken in Gujarat, though Akbar later on sent a *farmān* to the governor asking him to protect the Jain temples from further injury. A cartload of idols was removed from the temples by a Mughal officer and was yielded up to a Jain on payment of money some time after 1578.²⁰

Such seem to have been—and continued to be—the popular prejudices against the Hindus.

Akbar's Heritage

✓ Akbar's task was, therefore, not an easy one. He had to formulate his religious policy in this atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion. There would have been nothing easier than to continue the age-long traditions and govern as most of

his predecessors had governed in India. But it seems that the problem as Akbar saw it was complicated. It is true that most of the Muslim kings in India had governed as outsiders but their fate left an interesting lesson behind it. Their occupation and government of India seemed to have been superficial. Dynasties had risen and crumbled to the ground with a suspicious ease. During the last three centuries, the Slaves, the Khilijis, the Tughlaqs, the Sayyids, the Lodis, the Mughals and the Suris had had their turn. The average life of these dynasties had been fifty years. Akbar's father, Humāyūn, had been expelled from India easily enough. It seemed that to the Hindu population the names of their Muslim rulers, their places of origin, or their sub-castes did not matter. To them all were foreigners, non-Hindus and unholy. They were not ordinarily interested in their fate or in a change of dynasty. This fact stared Akbar in the face. Unlike his predecessors, he possessed an unusual amount of imagination and initiative. They had been content to govern, as of old, because they knew no better and were content to tread the beaten path. Akbar, like his grandfather Bābur but in a different field—loved adventure and was prepared to plunge into new experiments in government. Besides, he possessed an intensely religious nature and a profoundly inquisitive mind. This combination prevented his becoming a fanatic. Fortune favoured him in rather an unusual manner. His first Prime Minister and regent, Bairam Khān, was a Shi'a and, therefore, to a majority of Muslims in India, a heretic. He appointed 'Abdul Latif his tutor, who was so liberal in his views that among Sunnis he acquired the reputation of being a Shi'a (a heretic), and among Shi'as that of being a Sunnī and, therefore, again, a heretic.²¹ Bairam Khān further used his power as regent to appoint Shaikh Gadāi, a Shi'a, the *sadr-us-sadūr* of the empire.²² Humāyūn in his own days, as the emperor of India, had been suspected

of being a Shi'a²³ and like Bābur he had bought Persian aid with an outward show of respect for Shi'a practices and a promise to encourage the Shi'a religion in India.²⁴ All this weakened the outer bulwarks of the orthodox Sunnism in India and gave Akbar a starting point for his experiments.

1. His marriages with Hindu princesses further contributed to the liberalizing process. Before his time, such marriages had taken place.²⁵ But Akbar improved upon the earlier practice by allowing his Hindu spouses to perform their religious rites in the palace.²⁶ This had its effect upon his religious attitude to his people. If idol worship was tolerated in the palace, it would have looked rather unreasonable to prohibit it outside. Akbar, thus came to be surrounded by Hindu influences at home which must have worn away the natural repugnance of a Muslim, born and bred, for Hindu practices. Akbar's inquisitiveness also came to his help. He desired not only to profess and practise the faith of his forefathers, but to understand it as well. With this end in view, he established his 'House of Worship' and started religious discussions there. Here came theologians, scholars learned in law, Sufis of all grades and conditions, and his officers. When the discussions once started, it was discovered that orthodoxy was divided against itself. Differences of opinion appeared, not only on questions of detail, but of fundamentals as well.²⁷ Discussion on the number of wives a Muslim could lawfully marry went deeper and stirred up trouble over the question of the legality of the Nikāh and the Mutāh marriages.²⁸ When Jalāl-ud-Dīn was appointed to write a commentary on the Qur'ān it was discovered that the work could not proceed any further on account of the differences of opinion on many important matters.²⁹ 'One pronounced a thing lawful, another would pronounce the very same thing unlawful.'³⁰ But more disconcerting than this difference of opinion was the intolerance for each other's views exhibited by the mullās when they

happened to differ. At the very outset, as the emperor sat listening to their discussion 'a horrid noise and confusion arose'. The emperor was very much upset and commissioned Badāyūnī to report to him such disputants as talked nonsense and could not behave themselves. Badāyūnī in an 'aside', declared that this would empty the house of all its members.³¹ Hājī Ibrāhīm Sirhindī declared that wearing of yellow and red-coloured clothes was lawful. Sayyid Muhammad, the chief qāzī could not tolerate the expression of this heretic view and abused Ibrāhīm roundly in the imperial presence.³² 'They, the mullās, would call one another fool and heretic.' Their personal bickerings necessarily detracted much from their claims to infallibility. They did not even leave the ancient commentators alone. In order to support their arguments they quoted from ancient authorities and proved that there existed as great a difference of opinion among them as among their modern representatives.³³ The fall of the mullādom was hastened by its pretentiousness as well. 'Abdun Nabī, the sadr-us-sadūr, would not pay heed to even the greatest among the imperial officials. The emperor used to look after his shoes.³⁴ The combination of ecclesiastical office with unlimited patronage also brought forth its nemesis. The sadr-us-sadūrs were supposed to be the highest religious dignitaries in the empire. Left to themselves, the sadrs might have proved themselves patterns of saintly life. But to their office was attached, among other things, the distribution of royal charities. This left the holders of the office open to temptation. Patronage provided opportunities for corruption and left little room for saintliness of life. The dishonest and corrupt working of the ecclesiastical department under 'Abdun Nabī became a disgrace to the state.³⁵ Minor dignitaries were no better. Makhdūm-ul-Mulk, another leader of the orthodox party, invented and pursued a very disingenuous method of

defrauding the exchequer.³⁶ Hājī Ibrāhīm Sirhindī, provincial sadr of Gujarat, was indicted for bribery and dismissed.³⁷ Qāzī Jalāl-ud-Dīn of Multan forged a Royal order for half a million tankas.³⁸ These fraudulent acts made the holders of these offices unpopular. ‘Abdun Nabī was strangled to death in his bed in 1584 (992 A.H.).³⁹ Makhdūm-ul-Mulk died possessed of a princely fortune. Such representatives of orthodoxy naturally failed to impress the emperor and could not uphold their claims to exclusive protection much less to a right to persecute rival groups. This might, however, have never been noticed but for the fact that in Mubārak, Abu’l Fazl, and Faizī, Akbar got three kindred spirits able to meet the scholars on their own grounds and give them as good as, if not better than, they received. They had been victims of the spirit of vindictiveness and persecution which was so common in those days. When, at last they obtained royal protection, fortunately for them, their royal patron proved to be as liberal as themselves. But let us not forget that though they might have encouraged Akbar on his path, they did not choose it for him. Akbar had already made up his mind and made a start before they were allowed to be received at Court. Their reception was the effect of a liberal policy already decided upon, rather than its cause.

The religious ferment through which India was passing at that time also made its contribution to the final evolution of Akbar’s religious policy. Hindu India was at that time astir with life; the cult of devotion to a personal god had caught the imagination of some chosen spirits who were making it popular. The religious ideas of the people were in a melting pot. The leaders of the Bhakti movement were busy creating a saintly brotherhood in which weavers, butchers, cultivators and shopkeepers were rubbing shoulders with the high caste leaders of Vaishnava thought.⁴⁰ It was only in such an atmosphere that Hindu teachers could be

found willing enough to initiate the emperor into the mysteries of Hindu religion. A hidebound orthodoxy could not have tolerated this propagation of Hindu views to an outsider even though he was an emperor. Akbar's marriages with Hindu princesses and his relations with the Hindu rajas provided the means for bringing Hindu teachers of all shades of opinion to the religious discussions in the imperial presence. These meetings were thrown open to the adherents of other religions as well. Akbar's relations with the State of Bikaner procured for him the services of Karm Chand who had once served as a minister at the court of Bikaner. He was a Jain and through him were introduced to the court such eminent Jain scholars as Mān Singh and Jai Chand Sūrī.⁴¹

The presence of the Portuguese on the western coast enabled the emperor to request for and receive at his court three representatives of their religion.⁴² The Parsis were also invited.⁴³ These discussions in the 'Ibādat Khāna had their immediate influence outside as well. When the Hindus could dispute with security with the Muslim scholars nice points of their respective theologies in the palace, some sort of freedom of views was naturally secured outside its walls as well.

All these things played a part in shaping Akbar's religious policy. But it was his mind that gave definite shape to the policy of tolerance to the several religions in his kingdom. Many of these factors, if they tended to create a liberal atmosphere, were themselves in their turn created by Akbar's natural liberalism and political far-sightedness. It has been maintained, sometimes by way of reproach, that Akbar's religious policy was due to political rather than religious reasons. Even if that were true, it would not detract much from his greatness. As we shall soon see, Akbar's great achievement lay in liberating the state from its domination by the mullādom. Even if for the toleration

he granted to the vast majority of his subjects, he found sanctions outside orthodox Islam, it was not his fault. But this is far from being the case. Akbar's religious policy was intricately connected with his own religious views. It was the realization of the fact that 'the Truth is an inhabitant of every place',⁴⁴ that finally completed the process, which might have been begun earlier by Akbar's political sagacity.

The Jizya 1564

Let us now study what Akbar's religious policy was. The great achievement of Akbar in this field was the abolition of the hateful jizya.⁴⁵ As a tax the jizya was bad enough, it was retrogressive in its demand, and its incidence on income was great.⁴⁶ But it was hated more as a sign and emblem of inferiority. It implied a declaration that the Muslim rulers of India were still her conquerors, holding the inhabitants down by sheer force. It proclaimed the superiority of Islam over Hinduism in too brazen a fashion.⁴⁷ Every other aspect of the religious policy of Muslim emperors of India was founded upon the imposition of this tax. Thus its abolition in 1564 was a turning point in the history of the Muslim rule in India. As long as the jizya was levied, the Muslims were the only true citizens in the Muslim state. Hindus were subjects who acquired certain rights as a result of their undertaking to pay the jizya to their conquerors. With its abolition, Akbar created a common citizenship for all his subjects, Hindus and Muslims alike. Let us remember that this happened years before Abu'l Fazl and Faizi were introduced to the emperor.

Public Worship

Akbar further removed all restrictions from the public religious worship of non-Muslims. There had been restrictions on the building of new public temples and a tax on pilgrimages to Hindu places of worship. The imposition of

the pilgrimage tax was brought home to Akbar when he lay encamped at Muttia in 1563 at the time of a Hindu festival. It irked him to discover that his state was making money out of the religious obligations of the vast majority of his subjects. Forthwith orders were issued to stop the collection of the tax.⁴⁸ Akbar further removed all restrictions on the building of places of public worship as well.⁴⁹ This led to the building of numerous public temples in the famous places of Hindu pilgrimage. The rajas made most of their opportunities and built temples dedicated to their favourite gods. Mān Singh built a temple at Brindaban at a cost of half a million rupees and another at Benares. A cultured Muslim traveller describing some of these temples in his travel diary, compiled early in the reign of Jāhangīr, was so pleased with the beauty of their structure that he wished they had been built in the service of Islam rather than Hinduism.⁵⁰ A Christian church was built at Agra, another at Lahore,⁵¹ while permission to build churches at Cambay and Thatta⁵² was also secured. Several Jain temples seem to have been built at Satrunjaya and Ujjain.⁵³ Local tradition credits Akbar with the presentation of a golden umbrella to the shrine of the fire goddess of Jwalā Mukhī in the modern district of Kangra in the Punjab.⁵⁴

✓ Cultural Contacts

The permission to build temples and churches implied toleration of public worship after the Hindu and the Christian fashion.⁵⁵ Combined with the abolition of the pilgrimage tax, it made it possible for the followers of all religions to worship their gods in their own way. But Akbar's generosity and justice did not stop here. He had destroyed the prevalent myth that the public celebration of the Hindu worship was a profanation to Muslim ears and eyes. There was another fiction almost of the same type. The study of the religious books of other religions was, to the average Muslim

of the times, a sheer waste of time, if not worse. He was content with his own religion and had no use for anything else. "The Hindus, on their side, were not willing to let other prying eyes look into their religious books.⁵⁶ Akbar tried to break through these barriers which were keeping the two communities apart. He organized a translation department which, among other things, was entrusted with the task of translating the religious books of the Hindus into Persian. Sanskrit works had been translated into Persian and Arabic before, but these had been mostly secular. Akbar now ordered that the *Atkarva Veda*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Harivamsa*, and the *Rāmāyana* be translated into Persian. Most of these translations were completed to enrich the Persian literature and to extend toleration to Hindu religious books.⁵⁷

Conversions to other Religions

Under earlier kings conversions to other faiths from Islam were not allowed. Akbar's toleration, however, would not be complete till he had permitted all to follow whatever religion they liked. Hindus were permitted to reconvert to their faith such Hindus as had been forcibly compelled to accept Islam earlier.⁵⁸ In 1603, a written *farmān* was issued to allow the Christians to make willing converts.⁵⁹ Mullā Shāh Ahmad, a Shi'a, is known to have made some converts to his way of thinking.⁶⁰ Early in his reign Akbar stopped the practice of forcible conversion to Islam. Prisoners of war were usually made slaves and they were presumably converted by their masters. In 1562 Akbar abolished this barbarous custom.⁶¹ We do not know precisely how the prisoners of war were treated after this. Presumably they were set free when the war in which they had taken part ended with the submission of the chief they had served. What happened in other cases? Was no quarter given, as at Chitor, and were those who fell into the

hands of imperialists, slaughtered ? ⁶² Or were the prisoners of war otherwise employed in imperial service ?

Of course this did not put an end to forcible conversion everywhere, much less did it allow all new converts to Islam to be reconverted back to the faith of their forefathers. At Surat, we have already noticed that some Christian prisoners of war were asked to become Muslims and on their refusal were executed. A Portuguese was forcibly converted to Islam in 1604.⁶³ Elsewhere, as well, such things might have continued unchecked but active persecution of the Hindus and a systematic conversion of the believers of other religions to Islam seems to have come to an end.

Public Services

The permission to make converts was a very great concession to the members of other faiths. Before this it had been a capital offence.⁶⁴ Combined with other aspects of Akbar's policy, this permitted his Muslim and non-Muslim subjects to live together in peace without any fear of their religious activities being checked. But as we know from the history of political institutions elsewhere, toleration alone does not put an end to all the civic disabilities of citizens. Akbar knew that, and therefore, decided to remove all civic disabilities of non-Muslims. High public appointments had been the monopoly of the ruling caste till then.⁶⁵ The Muslims in India, like the English in the nineteenth century, formed the governing group from among whom all high officials were drawn. Akbar disregarded this monopoly and drew his officers from all ranks and conditions of men. Hindus were freely admitted to such high posts as they were fit for. Todar Mall became Akbar's finance minister and for some time his Prime Minister as well. Mān Singh, Bhagwān Dās, Rāi Singh and Todar Mall served at various times as governors of provinces. Out of 137

mansabdārs of 1,000 and above mentioned in the *Āin*, 14 were Hindus. Out of 415 mansabdārs of 200 or above, 51 were Hindus. The percentage of Hindu officers in Akbar's army is higher than the percentage of Indian officers holding the King's commissions in the army in India today. Against four governors in Akbar's reign of half a century, there has been only one Indian governor in India during a century and a half of the British rule. No one in British India has so far risen to the high rank which Todar Mall held, as the vice-regent and finance minister to Akbar in his whole empire. Of the twelve provincial finance ministers appointed in 1594-5 eight were Hindus.⁶⁶ Further Akbar devised another channel for the utilization of the administrative talents of the Hindus. Cases between Hindus had hitherto been decided by the Muslim jurists when they happened to be brought to the royal courts. Akbar set up new courts with Brahman judges to decide such cases.⁶⁷ For the success of the royal policy, Todar Mall as finance minister issued orders for the use of Persian as the uniform language of record throughout the empire.⁶⁸ The Hindus, who ran the lower sections of the accounts and the revenue departments of the empire, were thus compelled to learn the language. This helped to break down the barriers between the two denominations.

✓ Respect for Hindu Sentiments

Akbar's toleration was not simply passive. He was not content with being neutral alone. He saw no reason why his being a Muslim should prevent his showing respect to the religious sentiments of the vast majority of his subjects. As Badāyūnī puts it, 'on further hearing how much the people of the country prized their institutions, he began to look on them with affection'.⁶⁹ Use of beef was forbidden as the cow was considered a sacred animal by the Hindus.⁷⁰ Blochmann,⁷¹ and, following him, Vincent Smith⁷² are

wrong in stating that those who killed cows were awarded capital punishment. The Persian text of *Badāyūnī* records the fact that the Hindus kill good men if they kill cows. It has to be remembered that by this injunction Akbar did not interfere with the performances of any religious rites of the Muslim. The eating of beef was lawful for Muslims, not obligatory. We are further told that Akbar forbade the killing of animals on certain days in 1583 (991 A.H.).⁷³ *Jahāngir* when he mentions this fact, does not connect it with any anti-Muslim bias of Akbar. He seems to consider the prohibition in the same light in which the *Sūfīs* forbade the use of meat, by way of a self-denying ordinance. *Badāyūnī* declares that Akbar during these days abstained from taking meat as a religious penance. In 1590-1 (999 A.H.) Akbar is said to have forbidden the eating of the flesh of oxen, buffaloes, goats or sheep, horses and camels.⁷⁴ Fishing also was prohibited for some time when Akbar visited Kashmir in 1592.⁷⁵ It is difficult to decide whether Akbar simply made the use of these materials unlawful for himself or tried to enforce his own personal opinion about their being unlawful on his Muslim subjects as well. The flesh of goats and sheep was used in the royal kitchen at the time when the *Āīn* was compiled. Its price is also recorded in the *Āīn*.⁷⁶ Thus there is every reason to suppose that these injunctions were not enforced on his subjects by Akbar. There is no warrant for supposing with Vincent Smith,⁷⁷ that these measures amounted to a great persecution of the large flesh-eating Muslim population. Even today a vast majority of Muslims living in the villages eats flesh very rarely. We can almost safely presume that Akbar's acts were mostly pious expressions of personal opinion which were disregarded even in the royal kitchen. They do not seem to have been 'measures', in the sense of being laws, to be enforced by the state. Unlike Asoka and Aurangzeb, Akbar had no overseers of morals and these expressions of personal taste were expected to be

respected presumably just as much as, and no more than, Akbar's mode of dress. We are further told that Akbar 'avoided garlic, onion, beef, association with people with beards, and introduced these heretical practices in the assemblies'.⁷⁸ All that can be safely assumed is that Akbar avoided these things himself and tried to spread a distaste for them to his assemblies in the 'House of Worship' or the Court. There was no question of persecution. Indeed, some of the 'forbidden' food stuffs were openly sold in the markets and the price of the preparations containing them is recorded in the *Āin*.⁷⁹ Akbar, however, respected the feelings of the Hindus enough to abstain from the use of some of these articles. He also participated in some of the Hindu festivals. The *Rākḥī* was celebrated in the Court when the Brahmans came to tie strings of different types of threads to the imperial wrists. But it was a purely social festival as celebrated in Akbar's court. Even today its religious side is not much in evidence and the festival is celebrated simply as a means of making presents to the Brahmans and one's relatives. However after some time the celebration got so elaborate and ceremonious that Akbar discontinued the practice.⁸⁰ Further, he participated in the celebration of the *Dipāvalī*, the festival of lamps.⁸¹ Again, his participation was confined to its festive side only. There is nothing to suggest that he participated in the worship of the goddess of wealth which forms part of the festival. His participation in the celebration of the *Shivarātri* seems to bear a religious tinge.⁸² But all that Badāyūnī's account suggests is that he made that night an occasion for assembling *yogīs*, from far and near and listened to their discourses on their beliefs and practices. We cannot but treat all these things as constituting an attempt by Akbar to conciliate the Hindus without at the same time implying any disrespect to his own religion. Even today in States under Muslim rulers, Hindu officials attend the social and court ceremonies

held in connexion with many Muslim festivals and all officials, including the Muslims, attend similar Hindu festivals in the Hindu States. In the early days of the British acquisition of India, even Christian administrators participated in the celebration of Hindu and Muslim festivals without thereby ceasing to be Christians.

Social Reforms

Though Akbar was tolerant, he did not extend his toleration to anything he considered an evil practice. He was content to leave every one of his subjects to his own mode of worship. But if it was necessary for the sake of social reform or administrative convenience to take some action in a matter, he would not stop to inquire whether a particular measure had the religious sanction of the Hindus or the Muslims. On humanitarian grounds and for administrative efficiency he was not afraid of taking steps which might be considered by the Hindu or the Muslim orthodoxy as an interference with their religious (or social) practices. He discouraged child marriages⁸³ though they had then, as now, the sanction of both Hindu and Muslim orthodoxy. He permitted widow remarriages among the Hindus.⁸⁴ He prohibited the burning of young Hindu widows on the funeral pyre of their husbands if the marriage had not been consummated.⁸⁵ He would not, and could not, prohibit the evil custom of sati altogether but declared that no compulsion was to be used to compel an unwilling Hindu widow to burn herself. This was not merely a pious expression of his individual opinion. In one case he travelled hard in order to prevent the burning of an unwilling Rajput widow on her husband's funeral pyre. It was known that her son and parents were forcing the woman to perform the rite but Akbar arrived in time and showed his Rajput subjects that he would have his order obeyed, even if it went against their cherished religious or social usages.⁸⁶ He forbade marriages

between cousins and near relations, even though this was sanctioned by the Muslim law.⁸⁷ Similarly, circumcision of children of a tender age was forbidden.⁸⁸ He recognized the evil of drink, but made a compromise by controlling its use and restraining its evil influences instead of insisting either on total prohibition, as Aurangzeb tried to do, without much success, or shutting his eyes to the existence of the evil, as most of his predecessors had done. Shopkeepers were made to buy licences for the sale of liquor and Akbar fixed all liquor prices himself. The use of wine in moderation was allowed for medical purposes. It was sold only on the buyers' giving their names. This must have discouraged some who were not prepared to make their indulgence known to the public. He tried other means to control the evil effects of drink. Drunkenness was to be punished and disorderly conduct had to be paid for with a fine. He insisted on these regulations being enforced and every day, according to Badāyūnī, many drunkards were punished. But if Badāyūnī is to be believed, the evil of drink had gone so far that Akbar's measures fell short of Badāyūnī's—and presumably Akbar's—expectations.⁸⁹ We need not be surprised at the partial failure of Akbar in dealing with the drink problem. Most modern states have fared no better.

He made similar attempts to control prostitution. A special quarter was set apart for prostitutes. An officer was appointed and whosoever wanted to visit them or take them home had to give him his name and address. Akbar tried to insist on sending all women of ill-repute to this quarter when their proceedings became notorious.⁹⁰

Thus in dealing with these evils Akbar was far ahead of his times. He approached the modern methods of dealing with these questions in British India very closely. His measures remind one of the modern excise policy in British India, the municipal control of prostitution in Indian cities, the Sarda Act and early British measures to confine sati to

willing victims. His policy in dealing with these problems involved as much interference in the religion—as it was then understood—of the Hindus and the Muslims as the modern policy of the British Government does.

An attempt was made by him to deal with the beggar problem in the capital at least by setting apart three colonies for them where arrangements were made to maintain them by royal charity. Khair Pura for the Muslims, Dharm Pura for the Hindus and Jogī Pura for the Hindu *yogīs*, were the main organized centres.⁹¹ The seclusion to which women were generally condemned then was lessened by the setting apart of a time for women to visit the Exhibition of Trades and Industries in the Minā Bazar held once a month.⁹² This must have shocked many Muslims and Hindus alike. Gambling seems to have been so prevalent, in spite of Muslim injunction to the contrary, that Akbar not only recognized its existence but tried to bring it under state control.⁹³

Some Administrative Measures

To increase the efficiency of his government, Akbar adopted many new measures. He introduced trial by ordeal.⁹⁴ A standard year for official purposes was adopted. The Muslim lunar year, the Hindu Fasli year and the many local eras in use caused a good deal of administrative confusion. The lunar era was not suitable for revenue purposes as its months did not correspond with harvest seasons. On this account it was not possible to fix any date of the era either for the issue of demand slips to the cultivators, or for the collection of revenue. A new era with a solar year was therefore introduced in the year 1586 (994 A.H.) and called the Ilāhī Year.⁹⁵ It was not intended to, and it did not, supersede the use of the Hijrī era. The Ilāhī era was intended to be used in official records, oftener than not, along with the Hijrī dates. It did not involve the

disuse of the Muslim era either by Akbar or his subjects.⁹⁶ So convenient was the new era that it was continued by his successors including Aurangzeb who only gave precedence to the Hijrī dates in state papers.⁹⁷ Yet Akbar was so careful in respecting the religious feelings of his Muslim subjects that he hesitated long before the introduction of this measure lest its introduction be misunderstood. He had, earlier in 1582, tried, without success, to make the Hindus reckon the beginning of their month from after the 16th lunar day rather than the 29th.⁹⁸

Akbar was a patron of literature and science of all kinds. He refused to believe, unlike his Safavī contemporary of Persia, that only the legalities (Muslim theology, tradition and law) need be studied.⁹⁹ He patronized, therefore, the study of astronomy, mathematics, history, *belles lettres*, medicine and many other subjects.¹⁰⁰ A contemporary Persian poet regretfully recorded the fact that on account of the orthodoxy of the Persian princes it was impossible for any one to become learned in different sciences. Only when one came to India he acknowledged, could one really acquire proficiency in studies.¹⁰¹ Naturally the mullās who were themselves brought up on the old lore found the change hard to accept. It involved the disappearance of their monopoly of learning. They could hardly adapt themselves to the new order of things and keenly resented this change. Badāyūnī's wrath against the emperor who sponsored this change from 'classicism' to 'modernism' can be easily understood. It is not necessary to believe him when he tells us that the emperor interdicted the study of Arabic.¹⁰² It is only the lamentation of an old man on the passing away of the old order. We know Akbar's library contained Arabic books.¹⁰³ Some Arabic works were translated under his patronage.¹⁰⁴ Again the assertion of Badāyūnī that Akbar directed that the letters peculiar to Arabic should not be used in spelling words in Persian¹⁰⁵

seems to have originated in his attempt at ridiculing the main plank of Akbar's policy. Akbar's innovation may best be considered as the attempt of a 'purist' to produce 'pure' Persian. But there is nothing to prove that this order was obeyed in the sense in which Badāyūnī wishes us to believe it was intended. No documents of Akbar's reign have come down to us with this peculiarly fantastic attempt at reforming spelling. The *Farāmīn-i-Salātīn* includes a *farmān* of Akbar dated 1595 (1004 A.H.), where many words appear without any change in their spelling.¹⁰⁶ This 'tale' therefore must be credited to Badāyūnī's resentment at Akbar's patronizing useful, as against purely religious, and modern, as against classical studies and accomplishments.

Akbar felt that the administration of the *sadr-us-sadūr*'s department was far from satisfactory. Even an orthodox Muslim of Badāyūnī's type was not pleased with the way things had been going on for years. The *sadrs* had had far too much power and they had not used it well. The first step in the direction of reforms here was the appointment of Makhdūm-ul-Mulk as the provincial *sadr* of the Punjab. Akbar, further reduced the powers of 'Abdun Nabī's successor in office, Sultān Khwāja. In 1581 he appointed six *sadrs* in the provinces.¹⁰⁷ Inquiries were also held into the rent free grants made earlier in the reign. 'Abdun Nabī's grants, according to Badāyūnī, were greater than those of all the previous emperors taken together.¹⁰⁸ Even under Shaikh Gadāī at least one theologian held a grant worth ten million tankas.¹⁰⁹ Akbar was therefore driven, in order to protect his own financial interests, to inquire into the grants so far made. On investigation he re-awarded the hereditary grants made to scholars, theologians, priests and teachers according to his own estimate of their worth. One class of people, however, suffered in these proceedings and according to Badāyūnī suffered justly. Those who

'enlisted disciples of their own, or held assemblies, or encouraged any kind of counterfeit worship' were imprisoned or exiled to Bengal or Sind.¹¹⁰ The leaders of the Ilāhī sect were exiled to Bhakkar and Qandahar and exchanged for colts. Their practices constituted 'a bundle of foul lies and nonsense', according to Badāyūnī.¹¹¹ But some shaikhs and faqīrs might have suffered innocently in the course of these proceedings. Badāyūnī's statement that they were exchanged for mules in Qandahar is either a repetition of the fate that befell the Jalālīs or must be referred to some other unpopular group of theologians. It would have been rather difficult to send any shaikhs or faqīrs as prisoners to Qandahar and there sell them as slaves among an orthodox Muslim population unless they had first lost all popular support. It was a punishment that could not have been carried out against popular or respected scholars and religious mendicants. Akbar had to transfer the grants made to many scholars because he discovered their influence on the people was not good. The collectors were given general directions to inquire into all cases of rent free grants of land and revert to the state the share of a deceased grantee, an absentee, or a public servant.¹¹² These measures seem to have been taken mostly in self-defence. Akbar's general policy is well illustrated by Badāyūnī's example who though as an orthodox mullā, got no preferment, was yet able to keep his original jāgīr of 1,000 bighas intact. In 1603-4, almost all the grants made in Gujarat were halved. The only exception made seems to have been the grant made to Dastūrjī Meharjī Rānā, a Parsi priest.¹¹³ Earlier periodical examination and resumption of these grants are mentioned by Badāyūnī himself and amply prove that Akbar was moved not by any feelings of revenge but by the economic necessities¹¹⁴ of the state.

The emperor further sanctioned the charging of interest.¹¹⁵ Here again he could not have made it obligatory. If good Muslims did not want to receive interest they could avoid it. But if their Hindu colleagues wanted a return for their money, Akbar made it possible for them to secure it through the imperial courts. The measure indicates a growth of commercial transaction between the Hindus and Muslims and seems to have been rendered necessary by commercial considerations.

Court Ceremonies

Akbar further introduced certain new ceremonies in court. The method of doing honour to the emperor by way of *kurnish* and *taslim* had been introduced by Humāyūn. Akbar, however, seems to have made it common.¹¹⁶ But despite the special pleadings of such divines as Tāj-ud-Dīn of Delhi,¹¹⁷ the faithful objected to it as against the teachings of Islam. Thereupon it was discontinued in the open court but permitted in the private audience chamber.¹¹⁸ But those who had any religious scruples were never compelled to undergo this indignity. In 1590-1 (999 A.H.) Badāyūnī refused to perform obeisance to the emperor in this fashion even when some courtiers urged him to do so. Not much harm came to him thereby.¹¹⁹ Four years later, in 1595-96 (1003 A.H.) however, he changed his mind and performed *sijida*.¹²⁰ It became the common method of salutation to the emperor and continued under Jahāngīr. Shāh Jahān excused the *sijida* to scholars but continued it for other people for some time.¹²¹

Akbar's charity adopted Tulādān, the Hindu custom of giving alms to the poor. On different auspicious occasions the emperor would be weighed against different materials which would then be given away to the needy, Hindus and Muslims alike.¹²² The institution so appealed to the generous instincts of the Mughal emperors that this

was continued even under the puritanical Aurangzeb whom we read of writing to one of his grandsons urging him to get weighed twice a year in order to ward off evil.¹²³

The Infallibility Decree

But the most important of Akbar's administrative measures was the promulgation of what has been miscalled the 'Infallibility Decree'. Akbar had tried to bring together his divines, but, as we have already seen, when they met, they failed to agree. Partly urged by the practical necessity of providing for an authoritative interpretation of the Law, partly led on by his own ambition to brook no rival authority in the state, Akbar secured the presentation of the following petition to him.

'Whereas Hindostan is now become the centre of security and peace, and the land of justice and beneficence, a large number of people, especially learned men and lawyers, have immigrated and chosen this country for their home.

'Now we, the principal 'Ulamā, who are not only well-versed in the several departments of Law and in the principles of jurisprudence, and well-acquainted with the edicts which rest on reason or testimony, but are also known for our piety and honest intentions, have duly considered the deep meaning, first, of the verse of the Qur'ān, "Obey God, and obey the Prophet, and those who have authority among you", and secondly, of the genuine tradition, "Surely the man who is dearest to God on the day of judgement is the Imām-i-'ādil; whosoever obeys the Amīr, obeys Thee; and whosoever rebels against him, rebels against Thee", and thirdly, of several other proofs based on reasoning or testimony; and we have agreed that the rank of Sultān-i-'ādil is higher in the eyes of God than the rank of a Mujtahid.

'Further, we declare that the King of Islam, Amīr of the Faithful, Shadow of God on the earth, Abul-fath Jalāl-

ud-Dīn Muḥammad Akbar, Pādshāh Ghāzī (May God his kingdom perpetuate) is a most wise, and a most Godfearing king.

‘Should, therefore, in future a religious question arise, regarding which the opinions of the Muḥtahids differ and His Majesty in his penetrating intellect and clear wisdom be inclined to adopt, for the benefit of the people and for the betterment of the administration of the country, any of the conflicting opinions which exist on that point he should issue an order to that effect.

‘We do hereby agree that such a decree shall be binding on us and on the whole nation. Further we declare that should His Majesty think fit to issue a new order all shall likewise be bound by it, provided always that such order shall not be in opposition to the injunctions of the Qur’ān and be also of real benefit to the people. Any opposition on the part of his subjects to such an order passed by His Majesty shall involve damnation in the world to come and loss of property and religious privileges in this.

‘This document has been written with honest intentions, for the glory of God and propagation of Islam, and is signed by us, the principal ‘Ulamā and the lawyers in the month of Rajab in the year 987.’¹²⁴

This declaration was drawn up by Mubārak but was signed by Makhdūm-ul-Mulk; ‘Abdun Nabī, the *sadr-us-sadūr*; Sadr Jahān, the Grand Muftī of the empire; Jalāl-ud-Dīn, the chief qāzi; Mubārak, ‘the deepest writer of the age’, and Ghāzī Khān, ‘unrivalled in various sciences’. The declaration was thus authoritative, bearing as it did the signatures of the highest religious dignitaries in the empire along with the two greatest scholars of the reign. Of course it has been very often urged that Mubārak was the emperor’s tool in the matter and that others had been dragged into signing it. Unfortunately, Badāyūnī on whose authority this statement is based seems to have been carried away by

his wrath against this lodging of an authority in the emperor which he thought rightly belonged to the divines. He makes two contradictory statements. In one place he declares that some signed it willingly, and others against their convictions. Elsewhere he tells us that only Mubārak signed it willingly.¹²⁵ This latter statement could not obviously have been true. Among the signatories, Jalāl-ud-Dīn was the emperor's nominee whom Akbar had recently appointed in supersession to his inconvenient predecessor.¹²⁶ Sadr-i-Jahān continued in his office long after the issue of this declaration¹²⁷ and could not have been opposed to its issue. Ghāzī Khān, a mansabdār, who continued in office till his death 1584 (992 A.H.) again seems to be little likely to require any undue pressure for putting his signature to this document. Makhdūm-ul-Mulk who had his eyes on the office of the *sadr-us-sadr* and 'Abdun Nabī who was filling it at this time are likely to comprise Badāyūnī's 'some who signed it against their convictions'. Their unwillingness can be easily understood.

But the nature of the document has been a little misunderstood in the heat of arguments raised over it.¹²⁸ It gave Akbar no power until and unless the divines failed to agree. Even then he had the power to interpret the Muslim law and not to make it. It is necessary to remember that Akbar only gathered into his own hands powers and functions which had been so far exercised by a subordinate functionary, the *sadr*. He did not create a new office, he brought an older one under imperial control. Even here Akbar differed from Aurangzeb. He assumed the right to be his own judge rather than dismiss a *sadr* who criticized him—as Aurangzeb did—and appoint a successor who would give a convenient opinion.¹²⁹ Akbar claimed to be infallible no more than the Privy Council or the House of Lords does. His interpretation of the laws was to be final, just as a ruling of the Privy Council is. Thus Akbar made no claim to

infallibility in any metaphysical sense. Still further his decision could not, and in fact did not, silence opposition to his views. As an instrument for suppressing opposition it was valueless. Decision given under its authority would not convince those who did not recognize it as valid. It could be used effectively only by Akbar himself for justifying his own personal practices. The main planks of his policy of toleration had already been laid. The Jizya had been abolished, the pilgrimage tax remitted, the Hindus admitted to public services, and public religious worship by other faiths tolerated long before the issue of this so-called 'Infallibility Decree'. These departures from the accepted orthodox policy had not necessitated any artificial support. The decree was only a manifestation of Akbar's anxiety to be considered a good Muslim. Badāyūnī's statement that after the Fatwa the distinction as hitherto understood between the lawful and the unlawful was obliterated, can have reference to Akbar's personal actions alone. No orders of his could force his people to adopt as lawful, modes of action which they considered unlawful. It was thus not a decree, much less an infallibility decree. All that it really affected was to take away from the theologians the right to persecute others for their opinions. Akbar did not claim to define the religious beliefs of his subjects and force his definition on them as the Tudor 'Governor of the Church' was claiming to do, at this time in England. No one was persecuted for belief in his own faith. Akbar issued no 'Thirty-nine Articles', nor did he enforce an 'Act of Uniformity'.

This 'Infallibility Decree' was issued between August and September, 1579, after Akbar had already earlier in March 1579, once tried to officiate as the leader of the faithful on Friday prayers. Much has been made of that incident as well. It is forgotten, however, that, as Faizī Sirhindī tells us ¹³⁰, Akbar only followed the example of his ancestors.

The Friday on which Akbar made this attempt came after Akbar had celebrated, in the company of theologians, scholars, lawyers and courtiers, the anniversary of the Prophet's death with due religious ceremonies.¹³¹

Marriage and Religion

In another field Akbar apparently restricted religious liberty. Mixed marriages were not allowed. Under the Muslim law, a Muslim could marry only a Muslim. Thus if a Hindu girl wanted to marry a Muslim, she had to be converted to Islam before the marriage could be solemnized. The problem of a Muslim girl trying to marry a Hindu was still more difficult. Her marriage would not be legal according to the Muslim law. It is doubtful whether the Hindu law, as then understood, sanctioned such marriages either, as long as the girl remained a Muslim. Akbar decreed that as such conversions to Hinduism or Islam were based on passion rather than on religion, they should not be permitted.¹³² He does not seem to have introduced any substantial change in the law in cases of mixed marriages. An earlier story related by Badāyūnī himself bears this out. A Muslim, Mūsa by name, who wanted to marry a Hindu girl, eloped with her and had then to keep himself and the girl concealed, for fear the parents of the girl would be able to get her back by judicial process if they learnt of their whereabouts.¹³³

The Alleged Persecution of the Muslims

There has always been much discussion regarding the question of Akbar's persecution of the Muslims. 'Akbar showed bitter hostility to the faith of his fathers and his own youth, and actually perpetrated a persecution of Islam,' says Dr Smith.¹³⁴ 'In the latter part of his life,' says Sir Wolsley Haig, 'he persecuted its followers and destroyed its places of worship.'¹³⁵ 'These are grave charges and, made

by serious students of history, they compel examination. They are based on two sets of authorities, the orthodox Badāyūnī and his followers and the Jesuit missionaries, who came to convert Akbar to their faith. A good deal of misunderstanding has been caused, however, by the confusing of two different questions. Akbar's personal practices might have become objectionable but they do not and cannot prove that he persecuted Islam. In deciding the question of his persecutions, therefore, we have to look for such acts of his as forced a line of conduct on his Muslim subjects which was contrary to Islam.

Even thus limited, Badāyūnī's list is formidable and the Jesuit statements carry it still further.

(i) Akbar made the wearing of silk dresses and ornaments obligatory at prayer times.

(ii) He forbade Islamic prayers.

(iii) He discontinued public prayers and the call to prayer in the Assembly Hall.

(iv) He forbade Muslim fasts.

(v) Pilgrimages to Mecca were stopped. Any one even mentioning the subject in 1595-6 (1004 A.H.) received capital punishment.

(vi) Muslim festivals were discontinued.

(vii) Akbar changed some names, wherein the name of the Prophet figured, in order to avoid using it.

(viii) Mosques and prayer rooms were turned into stables and given to Hindu chaukidars.

(ix) Akbar, when in need of money, would even plunder mosques.

(x) Shaving of the beard was allowed with the support of the unprincipled and scheming mullās.

(xi) The eating of the flesh of tigers and wild boars was permitted.

(xii) The king razed to the ground the towers built for the Muslim call to prayer.

(xiii) Mosques were turned into stables and those decaying were not repaired.

(xiv) Blochmann and Low have both interpreted a passage of Badāyūnī's implying that good men were killed in place of cows presumably by Akbar.

(xv) Another passage has been translated as stating that killers of animals on certain dates were either killed or their property confiscated.

(xvi) Besides, Akbar is generally credited with the design of 'annulling the statutes and ordinances of Islam'. Budāyūnī refers to Islam as having died in this reign,¹³⁶ and Mullā Ahmad described it as having become old.¹³⁷ He further adds that under Akbar all ceremonies of the Hindus had been introduced by the king.¹³⁸

Now to examine these complaints. In connexion with the first Badāyūnī is self-contradictory. If, as he says in (ii) prayers of Islam were forbidden, Akbar could not have made the use of the unlawful silken dresses and ornaments obligatory at them. Either prayers were still being held, in which case the second complaint disappears as also the third, or if they were not held, there could have been no point in making a certain dress obligatory. As we shall see, Akbar might have become remiss in offering public prayers himself, but that is a personal question. Akbar could not have forbidden the offering of Muslim prayers throughout his empire. No case of anyone being persecuted for offering prayers is on record anywhere. We have on the other hand the testimony of Badāyūnī himself to prove that when Mir Fath Ullah Shīrāzī offered his prayers in the open court, he was not interfered with at all. Akbar was so far from being offended with him on that account that he was appointed vizīr. Shaikh 'Ārif Husain, Mūsa and 'Abdul Ghos are also alleged by Badāyūnī himself as performing prayers in the imperial court. 'Abdul Ma'ālī said prayers with his companions, 'Abdus Samad is described as being

much occupied in praying.¹³⁹ The obligation to wear silk dresses at prayer times could only have been imposed on his courtiers alone and that also when they said their prayers in his company. It is rather ridiculous to suggest that it involved any persecution of Islam. The fourth charge is that Akbar forbade fasts. Did he go about compelling every one of his subjects to take their meals in the months of fasting? That could have been hardly possible. He might have discontinued keeping fasts himself but that would not amount to a persecution of Islam. Fortunately evidence is available at least of the year 1582 that the fasts were still kept by the faithful. Akbar's Muslim ambassador who had been sent to bring the Jesuit Fathers to the court stayed at Sultanpur, near Surat, for the purpose of celebrating the fast and the sacrifices connected with it.¹⁴⁰ The fifth complaint again is not tenable. The stoppage of pilgrimage is mentioned in the year 1582 (990 A.H.). But Gulbadan Begum returned from Mecca the same year and was royally welcomed. In 1584 (992 A.H.) Shāh 'Alī Tarāb brought the impress of the Prophet's foot from Mecca and it was received as a holy relic. It was brought to Ahmedabad where a splendid edifice was built for housing it. This took six years in building. A theologian was appointed to keep guard over it as over a sacred relic. When Badāyūnī completed his history, Qutb-i-Ālam was guarding it in 1595-6.¹⁴¹ More conclusive, however, is the account of Du Jarrie. The third Jesuit Mission while coming to the court in 1595 met in Gujarat many men and women going on a pilgrimage to Mecca.¹⁴² Khān-i-A'zam, governor of Gujarat, went to Mecca in 1593 (1001 A.H.), returned in 1594 (1002 A.H.), and came to the imperial court.¹⁴³ The discontinuance of the Muslim festivals cannot be termed persecution. It implies, if anything, Akbar's ceasing to celebrate them himself. The suggestion contained in the seventh is fantastic. Muhammad remained

a part of Akbar's name and occurs in many of the *farmāns* he issued in the latter half of his reign.¹⁴⁴ *Tabaqāt-i-Akbari*'s list of scholars and *grandeess* contains such names, as also Abu'l Fazl's list of the *grandeess*.¹⁴⁵ Badāyūnī's third volume, as well, contains many such names. What is Akbar supposed to have done? Did he issue a roving commission for the purpose of changing the names of such persons all over his extensive empire? Turning of mosques and prayer rooms into stables or porter's lodges may be true in some cases where Akbar's toleration made the maintenance of mosques in an entirely Hindu centre both impolitic as well as useless. It is possible that in some villages where mosques, like Protestant churches in Ireland in some places, were maintained simply as an emblem of the Muslim conquest, the mosques might have been converted to other uses. Akbar might have been utilitarian enough to turn such mosques to civil or military purposes. But if it implied that Akbar turned all mosques and prayer rooms into stables, or an appreciable number thereof either, one must deny it. On his march to Kahul Akbar set apart a special tent for prayers. He said public prayers on his return to India in the mosque at 'Ali Masjid.¹⁴⁶ Many mosques of his day are still standing. The Jesuit Fathers, who support Badāyūnī in these assertions, did not find the mosques of Delhi turned into stables or porter's lodges.¹⁴⁷

Mullā Ahmad writing in the reign of Jahāngīr, but referring probably to the reign of Akbar, declares that Islam had become so weak that the Hindus were destroying mosques without fear. But the only example that he cites in favour of this statement is the fact that the Hindus had destroyed the mosque built in the very midst of the tank, sacred to the Hindus, at Thanesar and built a temple.¹⁴⁸ Even if Mullā Ahmad's statement be accepted at its face value, it would only imply that the government was not strong enough to check these activities.

Murray's statement about Akbar's plundering mosques is based on misconception. They are usually hardly worth plundering and Akbar was very seldom in straits for money. The third Jesuit mission in 1595 did find the mosques in ruin because they had not been repaired. But then, this state of things refers to 'many towns and large cities which were mostly in a state of ruin'.¹⁴⁹ Shaving of the beard cannot constitute persecution. It could only have been a permissive order. The eleventh again is permissive, not mandatory. Such 'unlawful' meat does not seem to have been forced on any one. Those who took it might have been saved from punishment. The twelfth again is an exaggeration. We have already dealt with the thirteenth. The general statements of Badāyūnī remain. But he is not sure in his description of the state of things that ensued. Sometimes the Shi'ism seems to him to have been gaining ground, at others he is bewailing the disappearance of Islam and yet again talking of the progress of Hinduism.¹⁵⁰ As we shall presently see the whole regime of toleration was distasteful to Badāyūnī and his sort and in their disgust they gave it different names. While Badāyūnī talks of Islam as a dead religion, Du Jarric in describing the persecution of the Fathers of the Third Mission speaks of Muhammadanism and Hinduism as 'strongly established' in 1603.¹⁵¹

His Religious Beliefs

Another charge remains. Vincent Smith is definite in his opinion that after 1582 Akbar ceased to be a Muslim. Unfortunately even he cannot get away from certain facts which are based about Akbar's faith in Islam. He holds Akbar, therefore, guilty of still another sin, hypocrisy. The reasoning is rather ingenious. Akbar was not a Muslim presumably because he was not practising certain rites. When he practises them, he is called a hypocrite and there

is an end of the matter! But Vincent Smith, unfortunately, overlooked certain other inconvenient facts. The Jesuit letters may be 'full of emphatic declaration that at the time of the First Mission Akbar was not a Muslim', but Du Jarric's account mentions that Akbar held many disputations with the Fathers of the First Mission in defence of Islam. When the mullās could not defend the Muslim conception of paradise, Akbar came to their help and tried to defend it. Similarly he so earnestly tried to defend his mullās on another occasion that the Fathers were reluctantly compelled to conclude that they had no chance whatever of converting him to Christianity. Botelho writing in 1648-54 declared that 'in spite of discussions the king remained as much a Moor as before'. Peruschi writing in 1595 no doubt mentions rumours current about Akbar's religious beliefs. He comes to the conclusion that the more intelligent think him to be a Muhammadan who outwardly conforms to all religions in order to obtain popularity. Akbar's letter written in 1582 to the philosophers of Europe and entrusted to Monserrate on his departure speaks of the Prophet with all respect.¹⁵² Further in his letters to 'Abdulla Khān Uzbek written in 1586 Akbar definitely declares himself a Muslim and proudly boasts that on account of his conquests Islam had now spread to territories where it had never been heard of before and the temples of the non-believers had been converted into mosques. He also roundly declares that the institutes of the Prophet and revelation of God have always been his guides.¹⁵³ Thus Akbar seems to have considered himself a Muslim almost to the very end of his life.)

But we have to admit that to Badāyūnī and men of his way of thinking Akbar ceased to be a Muslim. The orthodox spread tales of his fall from the true path throughout the empire. The courts of the independent kings in the Deccan rang with rumours of his apostasy.¹⁵⁴ In Persia, Kabul and

Turan these stories were often told.¹⁵⁵ Even here in India, a rebellion was organized ostensibly on behalf of the true faith. But the failure of this rebellion, even when Akbar's brother Hakīm had been discovered as a convenient peg on which to hang the claims for an empire, proves that to a majority of his Muslim courtiers and subjects, Akbar had not fallen enough from the true path to merit the fate of an apostate.¹⁵⁶ When Prince Salīm rebelled against his father, he could have found his father's apostasy a very powerful weapon against him. But neither Jahāngīr nor his historians use this argument to justify his rebellion.¹⁵⁷ Salīm no doubt got Abu'l Fazl murdered but all that he alleges against him is his ascendancy in the councils of his father. He could have conveniently mentioned Akbar's renunciation of Islam as an excuse for his own crime at least. His silence is suggestive. We have it on the authority of Du Jarric that when in 1598 a Christian accepted Islam in order to be able to marry the niece of his dead wife, though Prince Salīm desired to punish him, he dared not do so for fear of his father who obviously must have been pleased at this conversion. A little later in 1599 the Fathers converted a Muslim girl. They were afraid that if the matter was made public and brought before the judges, they would hold it against the Qur'ān and the king's regulations. Such a king could not have ceased to be a Muslim. Monserrate again tells us that 'Akbar does not listen to actors because acting is forbidden by the Muslim Law'. Here again we have evidence enough to prove that Akbar was a Muslim. Botelho declared that Akbar died a Muslim and Roe also came to the conclusion that Akbar remained a Muslim all his life and was one when he died.¹

But let us examine the delinquencies of Akbar as set down by the Jesuits and the orthodox mullās. Akbar is accused of having violated the law because from 1591-92 (1000 A.H.) onwards he shaved his beard. He kept

dogs and pigs in the palace yard and inspected them every morning. He discontinued keeping fasts. Bīrbar, Abu'l Fazl and Hākīm Gīlānī, we are told, 'led Akbar to reject inspiration, prophetship, miracles, even the whole law'. 'He listened to the early history of Islam and began to think less of the Companions of the Prophet.' He gave up going to public prayers. Akbar laid aside 'the Resurrection and Judgement and other details, and traditions of which the Prophet was the repository'. 'He ceased to believe in the evil spirits, angels, invisible beings, the Prophet's method of receiving revelation and miracles and the authority of the prophets and the Imām.' He is further accused of acknowledging 'reason to be the basis of all religion' and of possessing 'a spirit of inquiry opposed to every principle'. All doctrines of Islam, Akbar is said to have set down as 'senseless'. It is further said that Akbar examined some accounts of the Prophet's life and refused to believe certain incidents, as related therein. But what Badāyūnī really says is that others made such remarks in Akbar's presence and not the king himself. We have then Badāyūnī's specific statement that till 1578-79 (986 A.H.) Akbar was an earnest seeker after truth. But on account of the quarrels of the mullās themselves, 'doubt was heaped upon doubt so that after five or six years (1584-85) not a trace of Islam was left in him'. The *Ā'in* also quotes a saying of his that 'not being himself a Muslim it was unjust to force others to become such'. Du Jarric is emphatic in his assertion that 'he is certainly not a Muhammadan'.¹⁵⁹ Mullā Ahmad suggests that in the reign of Akbar enmity of the king towards the Prophet could be inferred and further adds that the qāzīs were not appointed. But the only example he mentions is of Sirhind where there was no qāzī for some years.¹⁶⁰

Most of these things concern matters of belief rather than action.

It is not possible for anyone to assert with certainty what Akbar did or did not actually believe. Some of the misunderstanding is due to the fact that Akbar's detractors have attributed to Akbar himself, some of the statements he allowed to be made by others in his presence.

But in two things Akbar seems to have obviously violated Muslim commandments. He kept a perpetual fire burning and as he sat in the *Jharoka Darshan* (the Salutation Balcony) he kept muttering one thousand and more names of the Sun which had been particularly strung together in Sanskrit verse for his special benefit.¹⁶¹ He had a peculiar regard for the Sun and fire and had had Zoroastrian priests come to him and explain the mysteries of their religion. The Hindu scholars as well had been instructing him in their own mysterious ways and in his own fashion he had been receiving such impressions from their teachings as he could.¹⁶² It is necessary to remember, however, that as Badāyūnī tells us, Akbar did all these things in order to 'subdue the Sun to his wishes'.¹⁶³

But though he assimilated as well as discarded several views from the teachings from different religious teachers he remained a monotheist.¹⁶⁴ He did not worship the Sun as a god but considered it the most powerful manifestation of God. He did not worship fire either.¹⁶⁵ There is nothing to warrant the statement of Smith that Akbar hated the very name of the Prophet. Despite all that is recorded by Badāyūnī, his belief in the Prophet remained unshaken and any one insulting the Prophet in his dominions was sure of having a dagger plunged in his breast even in 1598. He cautioned even the Christian Fathers of the first mission to take care not to slander the Prophet. The *Akbar Nāma* mentions the Prophet with all respect, Faizi's *Nal-o-Daman* presented to Akbar in 1595 contains a section on the Prophet's praise.¹⁶⁶ The assertion of the *Ā'in*, that Akbar did not regard himself a Muslim falls to the ground when

confronted with Akbar's assertion in his letters to 'Abdulla Khān that he was a sound Muslim and a follower of the Prophet as well. It simply implies that he could not consider himself as one fulfilling all the ordinances of Islam—a common enough confession in the Orient.

✓ The Dīn-i-Ilāhī

But then there is the Dīn-i-Ilāhī to be explained. Its official name was Ishid-i-Ilāhī, divine monotheism. From the meagre information that is available in the *Ā'in* about its beliefs and practices, Badāyūnī, and the *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib*, it would be a gross exaggeration to give it the rank of a religion. It had no book, no priests, no ceremonies, and practically no religious belief.¹⁶⁷ It was an order rather than a religion and more akin to freemasonry than any religious movement. Smith, on the authority of Bartoli and Badāyūnī, dates the proclamation of the Dīn-i-Ilāhī in the beginning of the year 1582.¹⁶⁸ Yet according to Monserrate, the first Jesuit Mission when it left in 1583 had only suspicions that Akbar intended to found a new religion of his own.¹⁶⁹ Botelho writing in 1648-54 declared that Akbar desired to found a new religion combining Islam and Christianity.¹⁷⁰ Even Pinheiro, writing in September, 1595, from the royal court, is doubtful about the religion Akbar followed. 'It is the opinion of the many,' writes Pinheiro, 'that he aims at making a new religion of which he himself is to be the head.' He admits that 'it is said that he already has numerous followers', but is not prepared to vouchsafe for the fact himself. All that he can definitely say in the matter is that 'it is more or less certain that he has a strong desire to be looked upon, and esteemed as a god, or some great prophet'.¹⁷¹ It must be a curious sort of religion, the existence of which was as yet a matter of doubt even thirteen years after its inception. Monserrate

and Pinheiro's statements knock the bottom out of the story of a council held for the purpose of promulgating the new religion. After the date assigned for the foundation of the Dīn-i-Ilāhī, Akbar is found defending his mullās so earnestly that the Fathers think of retiring from the task of converting him. A thing discussed and promulgated after a public meeting of Akbar's advisers could not have been concealed from the Fathers of the First Mission and must have found a place in Monserrate's account and Du Jarrie's history of the Three Missions. Smith has further confused the *Darshaniyās* with the followers of Dīn-i-Ilāhī.¹⁷² *Darshaniyās* were those of Akbar's subjects who had taken a vow not to take their meals without having obtained a sight of Akbar. After his death they behaved in the same fashion towards his successor.¹⁷³ Still further Smith has exalted the voluntary statement, made by one courtier, into a regulation issued by Akbar for followers of Dīn-i-Ilāhī. Badāyūnī only states that Mirzā Jānī and other apostates signed a declaration that they 'had abjured Islam, accepted the four grades of entire devotion and embraced the Dīn-i-Ilāhī of Akbar Shah'. He stops short of suggesting that Akbar ordered all members of the Divine Faith to sign such declarations.¹⁷⁴ Badāyūnī admits that Akbar never used persuasion, force, or bribery for gaining adherence to his opinions and that he took care to broadcast it that those who joined the band should expect no favours from him. Smith accuses those who joined the ranks of Akbar as being mostly actuated by such base motives.¹⁷⁵ Thus it is clear whatever Dīn-i-Ilāhī was, Akbar was not very anxious to obtain adherents for it. He seldom used the resources of his empire for advancing the fortunes of those who were admitted thereto still less did he force his subjects to adopt it. He had overthrown the conception of a state religion in India. It was not to be revived even in the service of the order he had created. It seems that it aimed at nothing

higher than banding together a number of Akbar's courtiers in personal devotion to their ruler. The only obligation its entrants assumed was devotion to Akbar, their only badge of brotherhood was Akbar's likeness, the only leader they were to follow was Akbar. It is true Akbar laid down some rules of life for these devotees of his, but it would be a mistake to exalt the order into a religion on that account. He appointed no missionaries. Badāyūnī's statements about the members who joined are all vague. At one place he declares that all courtiers—of whom he was one—became 'Akbar's faithful disciples'—but not converts to the *Din-i-Ilāhī*. Numerous conversions are said to have taken place on the coronation day in 1582 (992 A.H.) in batches of twelve. 'Base and low men of higher and lower classes professed themselves his disciples.' There is no warrant for Van Noer's statement that in 1585—or at any other time—thousands were admitted into the fold of the *Din-i-Ilāhī*.¹⁷⁶ In fact no attempt seems to have been made to admit the masses.)

Of course the Hindus and the Muslims alike deified Akbar who is said to have performed many miracles in spite of the fact that Badāyūnī declares him to be a disbeliever in miracles.¹⁷⁷ His 'mere sight is said to have produced enlightenment. He breathed on cups of water which were then used for curing the suffering: He prophesied future events. Vows were made to Akbar and when they were fulfilled offerings were made to him. He cured the sick. He joined together the tongue of a recluse who had cut it into two. Akbar's clothes, we are assured, fitted every one.¹⁷⁸

We admit that, like most kings, Akbar was susceptible to a good deal of flattery. It is not to be wondered at that his achievements turned his head a little and he came to believe, according to his friend and biographer, that he could work miracles. But those who know the Indian masses would

readily testify that their credulity is amazing and a man need not claim to be a prophet before such tales will be believed of him. Even today many men are found in the countryside about whom similar tales are told. Thus Akbar's miracles do not constitute proof enough of the fact that he claimed to be a prophet. Badāyūnī in his third volume mentions several Muslim saints who were credited with the power of working miracles. His *Dīn-i-Ilāhī* was neither 'a monument of his folly' nor of great wisdom. It was an attempt at getting together a band of enthusiastically devoted followers, some of whom like the English murderers of Becket, were prepared to give their all in the royal service. Badāyūnī talks of the four degrees of devotion to His Majesty being defined in 1578 (988 A.H.).¹⁷⁹ Readiness to sacrifice religion would naturally mean sacrificing one's religious principles—whatever they were—in Akbar's service and not conversion to another faith, the *Dīn-i-Ilāhī*. It was not an intellectual brotherhood either. Its only Hindu member was Raja Birbar. No adherents of Jainism or Zoroastrianism are found among its ranks. It was able to draw adherents mostly from the ranks of the Muslims alone. Whatever it was, it did not affect Akbar's religious policy as apart from his personal views. No one seems to have suffered for adherence to Islam or Hinduism either. Badāyūnī would have us believe in one place that many owed their places at court to their admission into the order. But, as he is at pains to admit, it was not because of any persuasion on the emperor's part.

It has been suggested that the initiation into the *Dīn-i-Ilāhī* was followed by Akbar's giving its members a likeness of his in gold which they were expected to wear round their necks by a gold chain. That it had no religious significance, is proved by the fact that Jahāngīr continued this practice and gave the Shist (this golden likeness) to Roe and Austin as a mark of honour.¹⁸⁰

Some writers have gone to the length of suggesting that Akbar claimed Divine honours.¹⁸¹ That 'Khalifat Ullah' (God's regent) was a title frequently used by Akbar and publicly assumed by him is true.¹⁸² But this carried no factual claim even to the Divine Right of Kings much less to Divinity. Akbar publicly denied that he ever intended making any such claim or that he had made it either.¹⁸³ His successors Jahāngīr,¹⁸⁴ Shāh Jahān,¹⁸⁵ and even Aurangzeb¹⁸⁶ continued bearing this title without being ever suspected or accused of laying claim to Divine honours. The legend, Allahu Akbar, was no doubt adopted by him for his coinage¹⁸⁷ and even introduced as a form of salutation.¹⁸⁸ But its use in Sūfi circles as a sort of formula in God's praise was already well recognized.¹⁸⁹ Its adoption by Akbar does not seem to have been resented even by the orthodox who continued using it.

His Critics

What can be said for Akbar's critics? The authority of the Jesuit Fathers is tainted because of the fact that though they were always ready to see him baptized, they never succeeded in bringing him into their fold. They took his spirit of inquiry as willingness to be converted. Accustomed to the horrors of the Inquisition, they were dazzled by the sight of a king, who allowed them full liberty of opinion. As he did not gainsay them, they thought he agreed with them. Their statements about his readiness to be converted are all an indication of their desire to see him admitted into their church and so are their statements about his having ceased to be a Muslim. We have to remember that Akbar understood neither Latin nor Portuguese nor did most of the Fathers know Persian well enough to converse with him. The conversation was almost always carried on with the help of interpreters. We have already seen that the general statements of the Jesuits are sometimes contradicted by

particulars they themselves relate. Naturally we cannot believe those general statements when they are opposed to the story they themselves tell us.

Badāyūnī alone remains. In order to understand his criticism it is necessary to understand him first. He was an ultra-conservative in religious matters for whom the beaten path was the only path to salvation. All non-Muslims were condemned to eternal hell according to him. He could not mention a Hindu name without boiling over with pious wrath. Shi'as were equally creatures for contempt. If Birbar is called 'a bastard', Shi'as were dubbed 'heretics, fools, worshippers of the devil, fit only to be cast out'. He could not tolerate even a scholar of Muhammad Ghaus's reputation if he happened to show common courtesy to Hindus. He would not go to pay his respects to Muhammad Ghaus when he discovered that he used to show respect to certain Hindus by rising to salute them. When Abu'l Faizī becomes a Shi'a, he is at a loss how to describe the change, and says alternately that he became a religious recluse and a Hindu. Islam to him seemed to centre not even in the observances of its outward ceremonials alone but in the display of militant hostility towards the non-Muslims. He was prepared heartily to condemn any one found negligent in those outward things. When Akbar sent Prince Dānyāl to learn Portuguese from the Fathers, Badāyūnī distorts this to mean that he sent him to learn the elements of Christianity. Thus if Badāyūnī describes Akbar as having founded a new faith, we should be rather cautious in accepting his word too literally. If he says that Akbar had ceased to be a Muslim, it only amounts to the fact that he ceased to be an instrument for perpetuating the fantastic distinctions between his Muslim and non-Muslim subjects. It is true he ascribes particular opinions to him, as well, but it is difficult to decide whether those opinions

are Akbar's or simply represent a point of view put forward in his religious discussions in the 'Ibādat Khāna.

Badāyūnī is himself a great enigma. He believed with Mubārak and Akbar in the advent of a new Mahdī. He helped Akbar in riding over his difficulty regarding the question of the number of wives the emperor could legally marry. He had little respect for many of the leaders of orthodoxy. He condemned prostration but performed it himself. He calls Akbar, a Khalīfa. He refused to hold with his friend Naqīb Khān that to follow a Hindu leader, even though serving a Muslim emperor, was not a sure method of gaining religious merit. 'Whosoever is appointed by the king is good enough for me.' He kissed Akbar's foot. But it seems that disappointed in his chances of recognition and reward he became a bitter enemy of the court party. Their religious vagaries supplied him with excuse enough for venting his wrath on them.¹⁹⁰)

It is well to remember that there are many other contemporary historians of Akbar besides Badāyūnī and Abu'l Fazl. Firishta wrote in Akbar's lifetime, and the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* was compiled while Akbar was still alive. Yet neither of these works represents Akbar either as a persecutor of Islam or the denier of its truth. 'Abdul Haq, author of *Tārīkh-i-Haqqī*, writing in the 42nd year of Akbar's reign prays: 'May it be the will of God that through the aid of this omnipresent emperor, the Muhammadan Law and Religion may be established for ever and ever.'¹⁹¹ 'Abdul Latīf writing early in the reign of Jahāngīr praises Akbar.¹⁹² But the list of those who give Akbar a clean bill is a very long one. Mubārak whom Badāyūnī at one place describes as a 'Shaikh-i-Kāmal'; Abu'l Fazl, Faizī, Qāzī Husain, Jalāl-ud-Dīn Multānī, 'a profound and learned man'; the Gilanī brothers, Sharif of 'Āmil, Tāj-ud-Dīn of Delhi, 'in mystic philosophy second to Shaikh 'Al Ahmad alone', Mullā Ullah Dād of Sirhind, 'the villainously irreligious Ulama

who in their works found the emperor to be without sin', and Mullā Shair are all found ranged on Akbar's side. The list at the end of the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* contains many names of scholars who are found serving the emperor in various capacities. This list includes muftīs (lawyers), teachers of repute, qāzīs of provinces, the sadr-us-sadūr, and Sūfī, of great authority. Badāyūnī's third volume contains many names of living scholars, theologians, teachers, and saints of repute some of whom were in receipt of allowances from the state. He describes India as full of such people and they do not seem to have been persecuted.¹⁹³ Despite the wailings of Badāyūnī, Islam was not a 'dead religion', nor do all the Muslims seem to have migrated to other countries. Even among his contemporaries, Akbar does not appear to have been regarded as a non-believer by any considerable section of his Muslim subjects. According to Finch his tomb was worshipped by pious Muslims in Jahāngīr's reign.¹⁹⁴

But even if all that Badāyūnī alleges against Akbar be accepted as true,¹⁹⁵ does Akbar become a non-Muslim thereby? In these days of Aman Ullahs, Razā Khāns, and Kamāl Pāshās, it is useless to condemn Akbar as a non-believer for having anticipated the march of events by some centuries. Akbar had offended the orthodox beyond any hope of pardon by his policy of toleration. Naturally they revenged themselves on Akbar by tarring his memory. We have seen that Akbar believed in one God and his prophet Muhammad. That coupled with the fact that he continued calling himself a Muslim is decisive.

His Achievements

On the larger question again it is difficult to agree with Akbar's detractors, Badāyūnī, Sir Wolsley Haig or Dr Smith, who have tried to represent Akbar as partial to Hindus and a persecutor of Muslims. As the foregoing

study shows Akbar's toleration was not absolute—it is not so even now under the British. In certain spheres without abandoning his policy of toleration Akbar preserved his liberty of action by refusing to be guided in all matters by the opinions of his theologians. His social legislation and some administrative measures prove that. He offended Hindus and Muslims alike when he tried to interfere in their social customs. It has been usual so far to focus attention only on those measures which affected Muslims. Interference with Hindu customs and usages is taken for granted as it was a recognized part of Muslim policy. But this is rather a distorted view of things. If one likes to assail Akbar's toleration, one will have to admit that, like the policy of the British Government in India today, it was not absolute, but relative. What can be fairly claimed for him is that he emancipated India from its domination by the religion of the minority. Other Muslim rulers in India had claimed such independence earlier but only to be able to persecute the Hindus better (e.g. 'Alā-ud-Dīn and Muhammad Tughlaq). Akbar emancipated the state from its thralldom to the Muslim theologians in order to create a common citizenship in India. His toleration was more comprehensive than that of his contemporary, the English queen, Elizabeth. Indeed it was not till the latter half of the nineteenth century that England was able to adopt religious toleration and freedom from civic disabilities to the extent to which Akbar had in India in the sixteenth century. The greatest of monarchs in his time, Akbar is sure of a very high place among the rulers of mankind for his brilliant success in the great adventure of governing men. Among the rulers of India he occupies a very high place for—among other things—his having attempted to bring Hindus and Muslims together with some success. If he did not succeed in creating a nation, it was because he could not hurry the march of events. It is worth

remembering that at a time when Europe was plunged into strife of warring sects, when Roman Catholics were burning Protestants at the stake, and Protestants were executing Roman Catholics, Akbar guaranteed peace not only to 'warring sects' but to differing religions. In the modern age, he was the first and almost the greatest experimenter in the field of religious toleration if the scope of his toleration, the races to which it was applied, and the contemporary conditions be taken into account.

NOTES

- 1 *Akbar Nāma*, II, 41, 42. Cf. also Badāyūnī, II, 17.
- 2 *Tārīkh-i-Muhammād* 'Arif Qandahārī, MS., 75; *Tārīkh-i-Afāghana*, MS., 128a; *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*, MS., 318.
- 3 *Inshā-i-Abu'l Fazl*, Story of Abu'l Fazl's Life, Badāyūnī, II, 198-9.
- 4 Badāyūnī, II, 198, 255.
- 5 *ibid.*, II, 155.
- 6 *ibid.*, II, 198.
- 7 *ibid.*, II, 198. This refers to the period before 982 A.H.
- 8 *ibid.*, II, 124, 125.
- 9 *Akbar Nāma*, II, 46; Badāyūnī, II, 364-5.
- 10 Badāyūnī, III, 80-1.
- 11 *ibid.*, 223, *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, 386.
- 12 Badāyūnī, II, 391. The date is of the order sanctioning re-conversion of such new Muslims to Hinduism.
- 13 *Āin*, III, 384.
- 14 Badāyūnī, II, 228.
- 15 *ibid.*, II, 231.
- 16 Monserrate, 167.
- 17 Badāyūnī, II, 162.
- 18 *Travels of 'Abdul Latīf*, 51.
- 19 *Tārīkh-i-Bāyazīd*, 263, 264.
- 20 Jayasoma, 66, 74.
- 21 *Akbar Nāma*, II, 20.
- 22 *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, 249.
- 23 Firishṭa, 372.
- 24 Jauhar, MS., 56.
- 25 Rao Maldev of Jodhpur is referred to as the father-in-law of the ruler of Nagore.
- 26 *Tazakīrat-ul-Malūk* by Rafī'-ud-Dīn Shīrāzī, MS., 566-7; *Akbar Nāma*, II, 159.
- 27 Badāyūnī, II, 255.
- 28 *ibid.*, 207, 208.
- 29 *ibid.*, 211.
- 30 *ibid.*, 259.
- 31 *ibid.*, 211.
- 32 *ibid.*, 210-11.
- 33 *ibid.*, 255, 259-60.
- 34 *ibid.*, 204, III, 80.
- 35 *ibid.*, 77, 204-6.
- 36 *ibid.*, 203.
- 37 This happened in 992 A.H. (Badāyūnī, II, 311).
- 38 *ibid.*, I, 313.
- 39 *ibid.*, I, 311.
- 40 Cf. the list of contemporary devotees in the *Bhakt Māl*. Kumbhu Dās is said to have been twice invited to the imperial court. His couplets quoted in *Mishra-Bandhu Vinod*, I, 278-9, refer to his experiences at the court and his subsequent refusal to revisit it. Akbar also saw Jadrūp Gosāin several times. (*Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 117).
- 41 Cf. *Life of Kurm Chandra* (Sanskrit) edited by Mm. Pt. Gauri Shanker Ojha, to whom I am indebted for his kindness in letting me have an advance copy of this work.
- 42 Cf. Du Jarric, *Akbar and the Jesuits*.
- 43 *Akbar Nāma*, III, 253.
- 44 Badāyūnī, II, 256.
- 45 *Akbar Nāma*, II, 203-4. Abu'l Fazl's comments are worth reproducing. 'In spite of the disapproval of statesmen, and of much chatter on the part of the

ignorant, a sublime decree was issued. On account of deep rooted enmity they (Akbar's predecessors) were guided up for the contempt and destruction of opposite factions, but for political purposes and their own advantage, they fixed a sum of money as equivalent and gave to it the name of the Jizya.'

46 Cf. below.

47 Cf. *Maktūbāt-u-Mullā Ahmad*, I, part 3, 84.

'The main object of levying Jizya on them (the Hindus) is their humiliation... God established (the custom of realizing) Jizya for their dishonour. The object is their humiliation and the (establishment of) prestige and dignity of the Muslims.'

48 *Akbar Nāma*, II, 190.

49 Du Jarric, 75. Churches were built at Agra and Thatta.

50 'Abdul Latif, 33-4, 50-1.

51 Annual report of the Jesuit Mission for 1597 in MacLagan, 77.

52 Xavier's letter for 1598 in MacLagan, 77, Du Jarric, 75.

53 *Life of Karm Chandra* 68.

54 'Oh, my mother! Akbar came barefooted. He donated a gold umbrella,' runs a popular song in the praise of the goddess. The *Akbar Nāma*, however, declares that though he intended visiting this shrine, difficulty in travelling prevented him from reaching the place. He may, however, have sent a donation. Akbar's visit to the neighbourhood is perpetuated in the existence of a Dharm Shāla at Churru in the District of Hoshiar-

pur. Its mahants claim that the place was founded by a personal grant from Akbar who allowed the founder, a recluse, to claim as much land as his cow could cover in a day.

55 Du Jarric, 28, 97; *Badāyūnī*, II, 371, 391.

56 *Badāyūnī*, II, 320.

57 Persian translations of Akbar's reign include besides those mentioned in the text, *Nal-o-Daman*, *Gangādhar*, *Mahāsh Mahānand*, *Lilāvati*, *Panchatantra*, *Memoirs of Bābur*, and two almanacs, one from Arabic, and another from Sanskrit.

58 *Badāyūnī*, II, 391.

59 Du Jarric, 152-9. Oral permission had been given much earlier. Cf. Du Jarric, 28, 30, 67, 70, 71, 87, 92, 94.

60 *Badāyūnī*, II, 317.

61 *Akbar Nāma*, II, 159.

62 The Portuguese prisoners from Daman were offered Islam or death as the two alternatives before them.

63 *MacLagan*, 100.

64 Cf. Tritton, also *Conversion and Reconversion to Hinduism during the Muslim Period* by Sri Ram Sharma.

65 Cf. above, Chapter I.

66 *Akbar Nāma*, III, 670.

67 *Badāyūnī*, II, 356.

68 *Khallāq-us-Siyyāq*, written during the times of Aurangzeb, mentions that Todar Mall made Persian the language of official record in the 28th year of Akbar's reign.

69 *Badāyūnī*, II, 258.

70 *ibid.*, II, 261, 303.

71 Blochmann, *Ann.*, I, 183-4.

72 Smith, 220. Blochmann was doubtful about his text and put a note of interrogation. But Smith ignored that.

Badāyūnī, II, 261, refers to the Hindus, in retaliation, killing those who kill cows. There is some confusion in the phraseology and order of the different phrases in the text.

Badāyūnī, III, 118-19, records that Hāji Sultān of Thanesar killed a cow there. The only punishment awarded to him was his transfer from the place. After some time he was made Karori of Thanesar and Karnal.

73 Badāyūnī, II, 321-2, *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 22.

Badāyūnī declares that those who killed animals on these days were killed and their property confiscated. Jahāngīr mentions the prohibition but does not mention any punishment for those who transgressed it. I see no reason to doubt that Jahāngīr's silence was not intentional. He said nothing because he had nothing to say. As we have seen in the text even the absolute prohibition of the slaughter of certain animals did not put a stop to their sale and use which fact is officially recorded in the *Āin*. It is too much to believe on the authority of Badāyūnī alone that people suffered the extreme penalty of the law for killing animals on certain days. The *Akbar Nāma*, III, 393, mentions the prohibition, but says nothing about punishments.

Abu'l Fazl had no reason to be reticent in the matter. Aquaviva's letter dated September 27, 1582, complains that the Jesuits were unable to get meat on Sundays (MacLagan, 57).

74 Badāyūnī, II, 376.

75 Jayasoma, 92. The *Akbar Nāma*, III, 380, however, speaks of an earlier order of 1582 prohibiting fishing in general on the suggestion of Khān-i-Khānān.

76 *Āin*, I, 58.

77 Smith's *Akbar*, 220.

78 Badāyūnī, II, 303.

79 *Āin*, I, 63.

80 Badāyūnī, II, 63, *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 126.

81 *Āin*, I, 216.

82 Badāyūnī, II, 325.

83 *Āin*, III, 398, Badāyūnī, II, 306.

84 Badāyūnī, II, 356.

85 Badāyūnī, II, 336, *Āin*, II, 375-6, 380.

86 She was the widow of Jaimal and a daughter of Raja Udai Singh of Jodhpur. Her son insisted on forcing her to burn herself and on Akbar's arrival was imprisoned for his offence. *Akbar Nāma*, III, 402.

87 *Āin*, II, 398, Badāyūnī, II, 306.

88 Badāyūnī, II, 301-2.

89 Badāyūnī, II, 302. Cf. however, *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, II, 169, 185, where an order of Akbar is mentioned prohibiting the manufacture, sale and use of spirits and proposing exemplary punishments for all offenders.

90 Badāyūnī, II, 302, 380.

91 Badāyūnī, II, 324, *Akbar Nāma*, III, 262.

92 *Āin*, I, 276.

- 93 Badāyūnī, II, 338.
 94 *ibid.*, II, 356.
 95 Badāyūnī, II, 301, *Āin*, II, 30, *Akbar Nāma*, II, 10-12, *Mīnāt-i-Akhundī*, II, 159-62 contains the full text of the Royal order.
 96 Letters of the period are still found in many collections bearing the Hijrī date.
 97 Documents of Aurangzeb's reign are in existence giving both the dates.
 98 Badāyūnī, II, 356.
 99 Brown, *Modern Persian Literature*, 28.
 'Abdulla Khān, king of Turan, prohibited the study of logic and philosophy in his kingdom.'
 100 Badāyūnī, II, 301, *Āin*, I, 279.
 101 Shibhī, III, 10.
 102 Badāyūnī, II, 306, 356, 363.
 103 *Āin*, I, 103.
 104 *Āin*, I, 104.
 105 Badāyūnī, II, 301.
 106 *Farāmīn-i-Salāṭīn*, 246.
 107 *Akbar Nāma*, III, 234, 372.
 108 Badāyūnī, II, 71, 204.
 109 *ibid.*, II, 34.
 110 *ibid.*, II, 278.
 111 *ibid.*, II, 299.
 112 *Āin*, II, 47.
 113 Cf. the *Farmān* reproduced in Modi, 138.
 114 Badāyūnī, II, 29-30.
 115 *ibid.*, II, 338.
 116 *Āin*, I, 158.
 117 Badāyūnī, II, 301.
 118 *Āin*, I, 158.
 119 Badāyūnī, II, 376.
 120 *ibid.*, II, 402.
 121 *Bādshāhnāma*, I, 110-12. See below.
 122 *Āin*, I, 266-7.
 123 *Letters of Aurangzeb*, letter No. 17. Aurangzeb declares that though weightment is not current among the Muslims of Persia, it is efficacious.
 124 Badāyūnī, II, 271-2.
 125 *ibid.*, II, 270-2.
 126 *ibid.*, II, 107, 110.
 127 *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, 392.
 128 Cf. Blochmann, Smith, 178-81, Haig, 364, Malloson, 158.
 129 See below Ch. V.
 130 Faizi Sirhindī, 257-8.
 131 *ibid.*, 246.
 132 Badāyūnī, II, 391-2, *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib*, 413.
 Smith (257) rather unfairly omits to notice the provision in the *Dabistān* concerning such conversions to Hinduism notwithstanding the fact that Blochmann refers to it. His criticism is therefore misplaced and unjust. Akbar treated Hindus and Muslims alike in this matter and there is no justification whatever for finding in this regulation a persecution of Islam. Badāyūnī records what appeared to him an invasion of Muslim rights though as we shall see below, he is wrong even there. Return of Muslim girls to their families was an ordinary affair for him and called for no comment or record.
 133 Badāyūnī, II, 110-18.
 134 *Akbar*, 257.
 135 *Cambridge Shorter History of India*, 378.
 136 Badāyūnī, II, 239, 265, 274, 301-7, 312, 322, Du Jarric, 44-5, 61. Cf. Monserrate, 64.
 137 *Murray's Travels*, II, 95.
 138 *Maktūbāt*, II, (7), 93.

- 139 Badāyūnī, II, 315, 316, III, 59, 92, 126, 139, 150.
 140 Monserrate, 13. Shāh Jahān was excused the duty of keeping fasts in his old age.
 141 Badāyūnī, II, 321, III, 111, *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, II, 138, 179.
 142 Du Jarric, 80.
 143 *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, II, 181, 182.
 144 Du Jarric, 46.
 145 *Tabaqāt*, 383-5, 388-92, 395, 398, 401-5.
 146 Monserrate, 155.
 147 *ibid.*, 95, 97-8.

Sub-leacon Leo Grignon, when he conveyed Akbar's invitation to Goa for the Second Mission, is said to have told the Provincial of Goa in 1590, 'The emperor turned all the mosques of the city where he lived into stables for elephants or horses on the pretence of preparation for war. He destroyed the Alquran'. Report of the Provincial of Goa dated 1590, quoted from Spitilli by MacLagan (62).

This is supposed to have reference to Lahore. It is needless to refute this statement because it is followed by the wholly incredible and untrue statement that Akbar had confined himself to one wife and distributed the rest among his courtiers.

Pinheiro's Letter dated 3 September 1595, repeats this assertion, 'in the city there is no mosque and no copy of the Qur'ān. The mosques previously erected have been turned into stables and public granaries'. (MacLagan, 70.)

Badāyūnī writing in 1595-6 (1004 A.H.) mentions among

living scholars, 'Abdul Qādir at Lahore, Qāzī Nūr Ullah of Lahore, a muhtasib at Lahore and Maulānā Muḥammad, Muftī of Lahore, who gave a public dinner on his completing his studies of the Muslim law and tradition. Badāyūnī, III, 101, 138, 154. It is impossible to believe that these Muslim divines had not a single copy of the Qur'ān between them. We cannot but reject such testimony. The qāzī, the muftī, and the muhtasib could not have functioned in a city where all mosques were stables and all copies of the Qur'ān had been lost.

- 148 *Maktūbāt-i-Mullā Ahmad*, II, (7), 93.
 149 Du Jarric, 61.
 150 Badāyūnī, II, 262, 265, 272, 309.
 151 Du Jarric, 192.
 152 Du Jarric, 192; Botelho quoted in Hosten, 150, Peruschi, 14, quoted by MacLagan, 52; Letters of Abu'l Fazl, No. VII (Section 1).
 153 *Letters*, Nos. 1-3.
 154 *Tazakīrat-ul-Malūk*, MS., 566-7.

Botelho was asked by 'Adil Shāh of Golkanda whether Akbar had been converted to Christianity. Botelho, however, had to confess that Akbar remained and died a Muslim. (Hosten, 151.)

- 155 *Letters of Abu'l Fazl*, from Akbar to 'Abdullā Khān of Turan written in 1588.
 156 Cf. *Letters of Abu'l Fazl*, from Akbar to 'Abdullā Khān written in 1586 and 1596.

- 157 Let it be thought that references to the hundreds of an earlier king by his son and successor were not considered in good taste and had only to refer to the accounts of Shāh Jahān's reign in *Iqbal Nāma Jahāngīrī* and the official histories of Shāh Jahān's reign.
- Jahāngīr, however, speaks with all reverence of Akbar's austerities. *Tazakirat-ul-Malak*, MS., 568, refers to Salīm's issuing a *Farman* when he rebelled justifying his action as taken in defence of the true faith and against Akbar's religious vagaries. It is difficult, however, to believe this statement. The writer further, tells us on page 468 that Jahāngīr became a follower of Dīn-i-Ilāhī after his accession. According to our author, then, whatever Akbar's religious vagaries, Salīm fell a victim thereto. Rafī'ud-Dīn wrote his account in far off Deccan.
- 158 Roe, II, 312, Botelho, 141, as quoted above, Monserrate, 171, 202, Du Jarric, 86-7, 94. Roe says, however, that Akbar began to make a breach into the law 'but that a certain outward reverence detained him and so he died in the formal profession of his sect'.
- 159 *Āin*, I, 290, III, 351-4, 388, Du Jarric, 68, Monserrate, 64-5, 67, Badāyūnī, II, 211, 255-7, 260-2, 273-5, 286, 301, 305-8, 312, 324-5.
- 160 Mullā Ahmad, I, Part 2, 45 and Part 3, 85.
- 161 Hiranand Shāstrī, IHQ., March 1933. Monserrate, 183-4.
- 162 Badāyūnī, II, 261, *Akbar Nāma*, III, 252-3.
- 163 Many Hindu scholars were received at one time or another at his court and played their part in giving him information on religious questions. The following names of Hindu servants, theologians, and men of God are mentioned in the *Āin-i-Akbarī*.
- Mādhav Sarasvatī, Madhu Sūdhān, Nārāyan, Harivijya Sūnī, Dāmodar Bhat, Rām Tirath, Narasingha, Parmendar, Āditya, Bāba Bilās, Babā Kapūr, Rama Bhadra, Yadu Rūp, Bishan Nāth, Rām Krishna Bhat, Vidyā Navās, Gorī Nāth, Gopī Nāth, Krishna Pandit Bhattachārya, Bhūgirath, Kāshī Nāth Bhattachārya, Vijaya Sen Sūrī, Bhānu Chandra.
- 164 Badāyūnī, II, 261.
- 165 'Why should considering this exalted element, which is the source of man's life and his continued existence, great, be held improper?' *Āin-i-Akbarī*, I, 43.
- 166 Smith, *Akbar*, 215-16, Du Jarric, 68, 84, Monserrate, 180, *Akbar Nāma*, III, 12, 281.
- 167 Badāyūnī quotes Bhagwān Dās having asked Akbar what this new 'religion' was and what opinion its followers held. Akbar is said 'to have reflected a little and ceased to urge the Raja'. Badāyūnī, II, 313. Akbar is said to have continued alteration in Islam thereafter (1592).
- 168 Smith, *Akbar*, 148.
- 169 Monserrate, 184, 151.
- 170 Botelho, quoted in Hosten, 151.
- 171 Du Jarric, corrected by Payne in his note, 68.

- 172 Smith, *Akbar*, 219.
 173 'Abdul Latif, 16, *Roe*, 314.
 174 Smith, *Akbar*, 216, cf. Badāyūnī, II, 301-5.
 175 Badāyūnī, II, 269, 291, 312-13, 336, 339, 364.
 176 Von Noer, *The Emperor Akbar*, I, 341.
 177 Badāyūnī, II, 291.
 178 *Āin*, I, 164-5, 169, III, 389-90, Du Jarric, 68-9.
 179 Badāyūnī, II, 291.
 180 *J.P.H.S.*, IV, 7, *Roe*, I, 244-5, Badāyūnī, II, 338.
 181 Rogers' *Catalogue of the Coins in the Punjab Government Museum*, XV.
 182 Badāyūnī, II, 278.
 183 *ibid.*, II, 210, *Akbar Nāma*, III, 271-2.
 184 *Iqbāl Nāma*, II, 303.
 185 'Amal-i-Sālih, I, 128.
 186 'Ālamgīr Nāma, 8, 20.
 187 *Akbar Nāma*, III, 271-2, Wright's *Catalogue of the Coins in the Punjab Museum*, III, 20, 22, 23, ff.
 188 Badāyūnī, II, 307.
 189 Cf. Mullā Ahmad.
 190 Badāyūnī, II, 8, 13, 64, 198, 207, 211, 226, 229, 246, 264, 273 and 304.
 191 Abdul Haq, quoted in Elliot's *Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muslim India*.
 192 *Travels*, II, 12.
 193 Badāyūnī, II, 158.

Badāyūnī's list includes the following living scholars and theologians serving in official

capacities. Ārif-i-Husain, III, 59.

Mūsa (*ibid.*, 92), Allāh Bakhsh, *sadr* of Gujarat (101), Jalāl, qāzī of Jaunpore (106), Quthb-i-Ālam at Delhi (110), Allāhdād, qāzī of Allahabad (117), 'Usmān (118), Īsa, muftī of Agra (129), Muhammad (133), Qāzī Nur Ullah of Lahore (138), a muhtasib at Lahore (138), maulana Muhammad, Mufti of Lahore (154), Shaikh Mansūr, fojdār of Bajwara (155).

Cf. *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, 389-93: *Āin-i-Akbarī*, III. Amin Ahmad Rāzī speaks of Mubārak, Abu'l Fazl and Faizi as three great scholars of Agra without imputing heresy either to them or their writings (*Haft Aqālim*, MS., 76b, 77a).

194 *Early Travellers*, ed. (Foster), 186.

195 Badāyūnī villifies Abu'l Fazl and Faizi as non-believers and as the arch-conspirators against Islam. Yet we find Faizi writing a commentary on the Qur'ān (completed in 1593-4) the only objection against which was its literary style. His *Diwān* contains verses soundly declaring his faith in the Prophet and his Companions.

دما پیر وی اطریقت اصحاب رسول ایم
 این شرح دیگر راه نما را نه شناسیم،

(quoted by Shibli in his *Shir'-ul-Ajam*, 54.

Appendix

HINDU MANSABDARS OF AKBAR

Haft Hazārī (7,000)

- 1 Mān Singh of Jaipur.

Pānj Hazārī (5,000)

- 2 Bhagwān Dās of Jaipur.
3 Bhār Mall of Jaipur.

Chahār Hazārī (4,000)

- 4 Todar Mall, Finance Minister.
5 Rāi Singh of Bikaner.
6 Jagan Nāth, son of Bhār Mall of Jaipur.

Do Hazārī (2,000)

- 7 Birbar.
8 Rām Chandra Bughela of Bandhav.
9 Kalyān Mall of Bikaner.
10 Surjan of Bundī.
11 Bhāo Singh.
12 Rām Dās Kachhwāhā.
13 Mahā Singh.

Yak Hazār Panj Sadī (1,500)

- 14 Durgā Sassodia of Rampur (in Rajputana).

Yak Hazar Do Sadī (1,200)

- 15 Rāi Shāl.

Yak Hazārī (1,000)

- 16 Rūpsi, brother of Raja Bhār Mall.
17 Udai Singh of Jodhpur.
18 Jagmāl, brother of Bhār Mall
19 Asakarn.
20 Kalyān Dās.

No Sadī (900)

- 21 Pratāp Singh.
22 Jagat Singh, son of Mān Singh.
23 Rāj Singh, son of Asakarn Kachhwāhā.
24 Bhōj of Bundi.

Haft Sadī (700)

- 25 Bihārī, son of Todar Mall.
26 Rāo Pitri Dās.
27 Medni Pat Chohān.
28 Bābū.
29 Salāhādī, son of Bhār Mall.

Pānj Sadī (500)

- 30 Parmānand.
31 Jagmāl.
32 Bhūm of Jaisalmer.
33 Arjun Singh, son of Mān Singh.
34 Sahāl Singh, son of Mān Singh.
35 Rām Chandra Bundela.
36 Rām Chandra of Orissa.
37 Dulpāt, son of Rāi Singh of Bikaner.

Chahār Sadī (400)

- 38 Shakti Singh, son of Mān Singh.
39 Manohar, son of Lūn Karn.
40 Rām Chandra Kachhwāhā.
41 Balaka Kachhwāhā.

Sih Sadī (300)

- 42 Bal Chandra Rāthor.
43 Keshav Dās, son of Jayamall.

- 44 Tulsi Dās Yādav.
- 45 Krishna Das.
- 46 Mān Singh Kachhāwāhā.
- 47 A Raja of Orissa.

Do Sad Panjāhī (250)

- 48 Jagat Singh, son of Raja Mān.
- 49 Mathrā Dās Khatrī.
- 50 Sanwāl Dās Yādav.
- 51 Mathrā Dās.
- 52 Keshav Dās Rāthor.
- 53 Udaud, zemindar of Orissa.
- 54 Sundar, zemindar of Orissa.

In 990 Akbar divided the work of the government into several departments. In all, forty-six public servants at the centre were appointed to look after the various affairs of the state. Out of these nine (Raja Todar Mall, Rāi Shāl,

Rāi Durgā, Rāi Surjan, Jagan Nāth, Lūn Karn, Asakarn, Jagmall, and Birbar) were Hindus (*Akbar Nāma*, III, 404-5).

In the year 31 (994) Akbar appointed two Joint Governors, one diwān, and one bakhsī, for every one of the twelve provinces of the empire. Of these, two diwāns (Todar Mall, the imperial diwān and diwān of Lahore and Rai Pitri Das, diwān of Bihar) were Hindus, besides one bakhsī (Tūrā Chand of Oudh), and six Joint Governors (Raja Jagan Nāth and Rāi Durgā of Ajmer, Raja Asakarn in Agra, Raja Mān Singh in Kabul, Raja Bhagwān Dās and Raō Rāi Singh in Lahore).

Chapter III

JAHĀNGĪR

His Accession

When Akbar lay dying, Jahāngīr was but nominally reconciled to his father. However, when at last he entered the royal presence, he was acknowledged by Akbar as his successor and on his father's death he quietly succeeded him. He inherited Akbar's liberal policy and tried to follow it.

As we have already seen, Akbar abolished the jizya and the pilgrimage tax, permitted conversions from Islam to other religions, put an end to persecutions for religious opinions, and freely allowed public celebrations of religious fairs and festivals of non-Muslims. Places of public worship had been built by the Hindus and Christians without hindrance. Admission to higher public services had ceased to be governed by religious considerations; Hindus, Muslims, and even Christians, were welcome at his court and allowed to serve the state to the best of their abilities. He patronized literature, art, and science, without narrow theological considerations. To conciliate the Hindus, he gave up many practices that were offensive to them. The court ceremonies were enriched by the introduction of many Hindu and old Persian customs. Administrative convenience further led him to adopt many measures that, to some, appeared opposed to Muslim tradition. His religious toleration, however, was bound up with humanitarian considerations and he made war on what he considered to be evil, even if it was sanctioned by contemporary Hindu or Muslim religious opinion. To bring the two communities together, he had Persian translations made of Hindu

religious works so that even Jahāngīr could assert that there was not much difference between the Sūfī traditions in Islam and the Vedāntist school of Hindu philosophy. Akbar's religious policy had resulted in fraternization of the two communities; as they were drawn together, their angularities were rubbed off, their hatred of each other decreased. The Hindus came to consider the Muslims less of a defiling influence, when they met them on terms of equality in the private audience-chamber, on the battlefield, and in the administrative secretariat. The Muslims ceased to think of the Hindus as an offence against their religion when they stood shoulder to shoulder with them in the great enterprise of governing India.

At Jahāngīr's accession, the Muslim theologians, who had not been pleased very much with Akbar's attempt at secularizing the State, seem to have tried to win back their lost influence. Mullā Shāh Ahmad, one of the greatest religious leaders of the age, wrote to various court dignitaries exhorting them to get this state of things altered in the very beginning of the reign because otherwise it would be difficult to accomplish anything later on.¹ His efforts seem to have been successful to some extent. Jahāngīr gave orders to Shaikh Farīd to submit to him names of four scholars who should be appointed to see that nothing that was against the Shari'at should take place. Here was the rub! Mullā Ahmad protested to Shaikh Farīd that this would not work. No four scholars would ever agree. He suggested therefore that only one scholar be appointed for the purpose.² Nothing however seems to have come out of this suggestion. The orthodox seem to have greater faith in Jahāngīr than in his father. He was characterized as being less favourably inclined to the Hindus; and the Muslims in general were asked to make persistent efforts to wean him from the customs and ceremonies of the Hindus.³

These efforts seem to have been partially successful only. Jahāngīr would not go back on the path of toleration which his father had opened. But without embarking on active persecution or impairing the newly acquired status of the Hindus, he began to take a greater interest in the fortunes of Islam in his own territories.

Conversion to Islam

Under Jahāngīr converts to Islam, according to Jesuit authorities, were given daily allowances.⁴ In the beginning of his reign in 1605 Jahāngīr forcibly converted an Armenian Christian, Zulqarneyn, to Islam but finding him steadfast in his religion he left him alone.⁵ In the tenth year of his reign Roz Afzūn, son of Raja Sangrām, 'was honoured by admission into Islam' and given the status of his father.⁶ A Hindu, who had been circumcized during Akbar's reign, is said to have been converted to Islam by Jahāngīr.⁷ A Goanese was admitted into the 'true faith' in 1606.⁸ Some prisoners were offered pardon if they turned Muslim.⁹ In order to protect the law, so Jahāngīr assures us, he had two Muslim young men, Qutub and Qumar Khan, whipped and imprisoned in his fourth year because they had been frequenting the house of a sanyāsī and seemed inclined towards Hinduism.¹⁰ Kalyān kept a Muslim dancing girl. In order to conceal the fact, he killed her parents and was duly punished in the second year.¹¹ Further, when Jahāngīr discovered in his fifteenth year that the Hindus at Rajauri converted and married Muslim girls of the locality, he gave orders that this practice be put a stop to and the guilty be punished.¹² Thus Jahāngīr attempted to act as the protector of the true faith and tried to defend it against attacks from without. But he would not tolerate forcible conversions. A royal order issued to provincial governors in the sixth year openly declared that they were not to convert anyone forcibly to Islam.¹³

Places of Worship

Jahāngīr continued, with some exceptions, his father's practice of allowing non-Muslims to build public places of worship. His friend, Bir Singh Bundela, built a magnificent temple at Muttra,¹⁴ which was now once again rising into prominence as the sacred city of the Vaishnavas. He raised another magnificent place of public worship in his own state as well. More than seventy new temples were built in Benares alone towards the end of his reign. They, were, however, not yet complete when Jahāngīr died.¹⁵ He allowed the Christian Fathers to open a church at Ahmedabad in 1620 and another at Hooghly. At Lahore and Agra public cemeteries were allowed to be set up.¹⁶

But when he made war on the Hindus and Christians these considerations were sometimes given up. When Mewar was invaded, many temples were demolished by the invading Mughal army.¹⁷ When he visited Kangra, he decided to celebrate the first Muslim occupation of this famous fort by a Muslim emperor by desecrating the Hindu temple and gloried in it.¹⁸ When he was at war with the Portuguese, the church at Agra was closed and the churches elsewhere also suffered similar indignities.¹⁹

Sometimes his fury would break out even without the aggravating cause of war. When he visited Ajmer in the eighth year, the temple of the boar god, Virāha, was destroyed and the idols were broken.²⁰ It was probably these instances that made a contemporary poet of his court sing his praises as the great Muslim emperor who converted temples into mosques.²¹

These exception, apart, Jahāngīr usually followed the path shown by his father. It is interesting to note that some of the Hindu shrines of Kangra and Muttra continued to attract a large number of Muslim pilgrims besides their Hindu votaries.²²

Pilgrimages

(Jahāngīr also continued to allow, as Akbar had done, Hindu pilgrims to visit, without hindrance, their holy places.) Coryat estimated the number of annual pilgrims to Hardwar in Jahāngīr's reign at 400,000. Roe was prepared to take it even to half a million visitors.²³ Of course there must have been other similar places of pilgrimages in other parts of the country as well. It appears that the open celebration of Hindu religious customs and festivals was continued, just as in Akbar's time.²⁴ In some places, at least certain days of Hindu fasts were observed as public holidays when no buying or selling—even of foodstuffs—was allowed.²⁵

Relations with Christians

Nor did he withdraw the permission granted to the Christians to make converts to their faith.²⁶ Non-Catholic writers are all agreed, that most of the converts the Christians made, were attracted by pecuniary considerations—an allowance according to Withington,—and renounced Christianity when it ceased to benefit them.²⁷ This is further proved by the statements made in the annual Jesuit letter from Goa, dated 1 February 1621.²⁸ Besides the needy, the Jesuits were able to convert the dying or to buy slaves and convert them.²⁹ Guerreiro tells us that some twenty persons, most of them whilom Christians, were baptized at Agra.³⁰ A Brahman and a Moor were converted at Lahore, but in secret.³¹ But the most sensational of the conversions was the public baptism of Dānyāl's sons and a grandson of Jahāngīr in 1610. The Fathers were overjoyed. Even the English Protestants participated in the public procession that was held through the streets in order to proclaim such good fortune.³² To the Jesuits it seemed that grace was at last settling on the princely house of Temur and they counted the time when it would be possible

for them to number the emperor himself among their followers. But they counted without their host. Jahāngir had not had the princes converted because he was convinced of the truth of Christianity. He had been told by his astrologer that his brother's line, rather than his own, would succeed him. To make that impossible he decided on this ingenious method of disqualifying them for the imperial throne by making them Christians.³³ Roe has another motive to offer. The king wanted a Portuguese wife and thought this was the easiest way to secure one.³⁴ Anyhow the conversion proved but a fitful affair and in 1611 they renounced Christianity and re-embraced Islam.³⁵ Thus were the Jesuit castles in the air shattered. Jahāngir was broad-minded or cynical enough to tempt Hawkins to his service by offering to procure a Muslim wife for him and to allow him to convert her to Christianity.³⁶

Jesuit accounts of their success in making converts seem to be more hopeful than true. Some of these assert that Muqarrīb Khān, customs officer at Cambay, was secretly converted to Christianity in 1611 when on a mission to Goa.³⁷ It is difficult to believe this story for various reasons. Muqarrīb Khān did not give up his numerous wives.³⁸ While he was governor of Surat in 1611-1618 he always favoured the Portuguese as against the English. Now his conversion, howsoever secret it may have been, would have at least become known among the English especially when they must have been on the lookout for anything that could give them an advantage against him in their dealings with the emperor.³⁹ Further, MacLagan, on the authority of the *Annual Letter* from Cochin, dated 1621, asserts that Muqarrīb Khān's son fell ill, was cured by Christian spells and prayers, and converted to Christianity.⁴⁰ But Guerreiro as translated by Payne stops short at the child's recovery and mentions no conversion.⁴¹ It is likely, therefore, that in this case the fact that Christian prayers

were uttered in order to restore the child to health was interpreted by some of the Christians to imply that he had become a Christian. Probably something similar happened to result in the Jesuit's giving currency to the report that Muqarrir Khān had been converted to Christianity.

The Jesuit accounts of their conversions soared even higher. Some of them reported that Jahāngīr had himself become a Christian in 1627⁴² though they made no attempt at reconciling this with the number of wives he kept. If, as the Fathers asserted, the number of Akbar's wives stood between him and Christianity, Jahāngīr was in no better position to be admitted to Christianity. In Akbar's case one of them invented the story that he had distributed all his wives except one among his nobles in preparation for Christianity. But to Jahāngīr they do not pay even that much of a compliment.⁴³

Jahāngīr not only tolerated Christianity, he maintained it as well. The Christian Fathers were paid from Rs3 to Rs7 daily; occasionally he would give them money for their religious services, and once at least he tried to relieve the distress of the Christian poor by a monthly grant of Rs50.⁴⁴

Jahāngīr and the Sikhs

(Jahāngīr's relations with the Sikhs raise many a thorny issue. Guru Arjun, the contemporary head of the Sikhs, had incurred Jahāngīr's displeasure on account of his proselytizing activities.) Some Muslims accepted him as their religious leader and thus came to renounce Islam. Two courses, Jahāngīr tells us, were open to him. He could either convert him to Islam forcibly or take steps to close his religious shop. He had been considering both these courses when fortune provided him with an excuse which settled the matter for him. When Khusru rebelled, he met the guru who blessed his enterprise. After the

suppression of this rebellion, Jahāngīr called the guru to his presence and awarded him capital punishment for countenancing treason.⁴⁵ Some influential Hindus, however, intervened and it was decided that the guru might be let off if he paid the heavy fine of Rs100,000.⁴⁶ A Hindu, probably Dīwān Chandū Lāl of Lahore,⁴⁷ stood surety for him in the hope that the guru's followers would probably pay that sum for the release of their spiritual chief. The guru seems to have discountenanced the attempt whereon the dīwān tried to force him to pay the money. Every attempt, however, failed, the guru died in imprisonment, and soon after the surety also suffered the same fate.⁴⁸

Though Jahāngīr declares it to have been his intention to close the shop of the Sikh guru for religious reasons, the actual facts contradict him. Had Jahāngīr's persecution of the guru been directed by religious motives, he would have persecuted the Sikhs as well. Neither Sikh tradition nor Muslim fanaticism tells us anything of any further persecution of the Sikhs. Guru Arjun's son, Guru Hargovind, was no doubt imprisoned by Jahāngīr but here again the motive was not religious. It is difficult to reconcile the Sikh tradition, which puts the imprisonment at a very short period followed by a reconciliation between the emperor and the guru, and the account given in *Dabistān* which extends this imprisonment over twelve years. The reason for this imprisonment according to *Dabistān* was the non-payment by Hargovind of the fine imposed on his father. The Sikh tradition places the imprisonment in 1612 whereas according to *Dabistān*, it occurred after 1616.⁴⁹ It seems probable that in taking action against Guru Arjun, Jahāngīr acted from mixed motives but when once his immediate purpose was served he left the Sikhs alone. It is further probable that Jahāngīr thought that the execution of their religious leader was so severe a blow to the

Sikhs in the Punjab as to make it unnecessary for him to take any further action against them.

Jahāngīr and the Jains

There is then the question of his attitude towards the Jains. Mān Singh and Bāl Chandra, the leaders of the two Jain schools of thought, had enjoyed royal hospitality under Akbar. When Khusru rebelled Mān Singh became guilty of an act of indiscretion. Rāi Singh of Bikaner consulted him in order to shape his own conduct during those troublesome days. Mān Singh told Rāi Singh that Jahāngīr's reign would not extend beyond two years. Believing in the prophecy of the Jain monk, Rāi Singh rebelled, threw up his command under Jahāngīr, and repaired to Bikaner. Khusru's capture however soon brought matters to an end. Rāi Singh was defeated but was soon pardoned and restored to his former position in the royal service.⁵⁰

Now Mān Singh's prophecy seems to have been reported to Jahāngīr. He could, however, take no action against him as Rāi Singh had been pardoned and Mān Singh was living under his protection at Bikaner. In the twelfth year, however, when Jahāngīr visited Gujarat where there were many Jains, he decided to embark upon their persecution. They were accused of having built temples and other buildings which were reported to be centres of disturbance. Their religious leaders were accused of immoral practices (probably of going about naked). They were generally believed to be a troublesome class of the Hindus. Jahāngīr first of all summoned Mān Singh to the court. Afraid of meeting a more ignominious fate, he took poison on his way to the emperor from Bikaner. Jahāngīr issued orders thereupon for the expulsion of the Jains from the imperial territories.⁵¹ These orders do not seem to have applied to the territory of the Rajput rajas where the Jains were driven to seek protection.

Jahāngīr here seems to have been prompted by religious rather than political motives. Unlike Guru Arjun, Mān Singh had been left alone for several years after his alleged act of treason. All Jains were punished irrespective of their political proclivities. Still further there was a section of the Jains who did not even acknowledge Mān Singh as their leader.⁵² They were also included in the order of expulsion. Dr Beni Prasad is wrong in stating that the order of expulsion was confined to one sect alone.⁵³ His version of this event is vitiated by the fact that he has neglected to take notice of the time when the order for expulsion was issued. His statement that the order was withdrawn some time after its promulgation is not supported by any authorities though he says that Jain works of the period are clear on the point.⁵⁴ He has named no works nor quoted from them. In the absence of such authorities it is not possible to believe that Jahāngīr withdrew the order. But even if any Jain authorities mention the withdrawal of such an order it is necessary to know the exact date. Dr Beni Prasad's statement leads one to believe that it was withdrawn some time after Khusru's rebellion. In that case the Jain testimony becomes valueless as Jahāngīr is referring to an order issued in the twelfth year of his reign. But, withdrawn or not, it was clearly an act of religious persecution. Jahāngīr himself is far from asserting that he issued the order on political grounds. We have to remember that Shāh Jahān was the governor of Gujarat at this time.⁵⁵ His orthodoxy may have had something to do with the issue of the order.

Muslim Heretics

Jahāngīr's attempt at playing the part of a protector of 'the true faith' led him into the persecution of religious opinions not favoured at court. Soon after his accession it was reported to him that Shaikh Ibrāhīm had set himself

up as a religious leader in a parganah of Lahore. He had gathered together a large number of Afghans as his followers. Jahāngir ordered him to be brought before him. He was not able to satisfy the emperor and was thereupon entrusted to Parvez to be imprisoned in the fortress of Chunar.⁵⁶

Qāzi Nūr Ullah was flogged to death by Jahāngir on account of his being an effective Shi'a writer.⁵⁷

Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindī's case is sometimes cited as another example of persecution for religious opinions. He had his deputies and followers in every part of the country. He was the leader of the Chistia, Qādaria, and Naqshbandia groups of Muslims. Some Muslim theologians complained to Jahāngir that in some of his writings Ahmad Sirhindī claimed to have risen to a status higher than that of the caliphs.⁵⁸ Jahāngir thereupon called him from Sirhind and asked him to explain his position. The shaikh was ready with his answer. He told Jahāngir that when he called one of his meanest servants to him, in order to approach him, the servant traversed the stations of all the amīrs, and stood nearer to the emperor than even the highest among them. Similarly there was nothing blasphemous in his stating that he had passed and left behind him even the caliphs. It did not prove that he claimed for himself any higher status. Jahāngir was not satisfied with this explanation. The emperor became silent. To add to the shaikh's enormities, a mansabdār suggested that the shaikh had not performed the *sijda* even. Now Khurram was a follower of the shaikh. When Jahāngir had summoned him, the prince had sent his messenger to the shaikh telling him that as the emperor was very keen on having the *sijda* performed to him, the shaikh should perform the *sijda*. Shāh Jahān undertook to see that no harm came to him. The shaikh, however, had turned down the suggestion of the prince and declared that no one could claim the

rite of prostration from him except God.⁵⁹ Jahāngīr now ordered that the shaikh be imprisoned in Gwalior under the supervision of Anī Rāi Singhdalan.⁶⁰

Unlike Shaikh Ibrāhīm, Ahmad was a great scholar. The punishment that was awarded to him had been more in the nature of chastisement for his refusal to perform the *sijda* than for his religious opinions. He was released in the fifteenth year on condition that he accompanied the emperor. Soon, however, he was given leave to go to Sirhind.⁶¹ His opinions had remained unchanged meanwhile—but Jahāngīr had discovered that his earlier order had been extorted from him by interested court theologians. Ahmad Sirhindī was thereupon honoured by royal gifts and was left alone by the emperor during the rest of his life. He died on 9 December 1624.⁶² Ahmad's persecution therefore was the result of theological animus rather than religious persecution. He was a great scholar and a profound writer. His writings include two volumes of his letters besides many theological works. He is still honoured as a great writer, scholar, and religious leader.

Fairs and Festivals

Then there is the question of the public celebration of the fairs and festivals of different religions. Guerreiro tells us that on his accession Jahāngīr restored the fairs and festivals of the Muslims.⁶³ Pelsaert gives an account of the celebration of the Muharram when so intense was the religious fanaticism engendered that no Hindu ventured out till midday.⁶⁴ The governor of Surat held a public polo match soon after the feast of the Ramazān on 10 October 1614.⁶⁵ In his thirteenth year Jahāngīr kept the fast of Ramazān and in the evening invited all the local shaikhs and sayyids to break their fast with him.⁶⁶ In his fourteenth year Jahāngīr celebrated the Shab-i-Barāt.⁶⁷ In the seventh year, Jahāngīr celebrated the Rākū festival for the first

time and had auspicious threads bound on his wrist.⁶⁸ He met the yogis on the night of the Shivarātri in his eleventh year, when he was staying the night at Sangor, renamed by him Kamalpur, in Bengal.⁶⁹ Dasehra was celebrated by the emperor by holding reviews of troops and elephants.⁷⁰ On the Dīpāvalī, Jahāngīr allowed gambling to go on in his presence.⁷¹ The Christians were publicly allowed to celebrate the Easter, the Christmas, and other festivals.⁷² Thus there was no restriction whatever on the public celebration of religious festivals. It was not Jahāngīr alone who thus took part in the celebration of Hindu festivals. Many Muhammadans—men and women—participated in the festivities that accompanied their celebration.⁷³

Religious Discussions

To some extent Jahāngīr continued the practice of his father of holding religious discussions with the followers of different faiths. The first one, he records, was with the Hindu pandits against their belief in the reincarnation of God in different forms.⁷⁴ Guerreiro speaks of his discussing religious questions with the Jesuits in 1607.⁷⁵ But in this case, unlike Akbar's discussions in the Abādāt-Khāna, it was the king alone who sat listening to the discourse of the Fathers on Christianity. A mansabdār or two and the king's reader are said to have been present but they do not seem to have taken much part in the discussions. The king would now and then try to bring his Muslim courtiers into the circle of conversation but it was usually only the king listening to the Jesuits. Jahāngīr saw the famous Muslim saint, Miān Mīr, at Lahore in order to benefit by his discourses.⁷⁶ He sent a letter to the governor of Gujarat asking him to pay something to the son of Wājib-ud-Dīn whose reputation had reached the court, in order to make him prepare and send a list of names of God specially selected for Jahāngīr's recitation,⁷⁷ though he

had already had a list of such names prepared by the learned men of his time.⁷⁸ With Jadurūp, the leader of the Vaishnavas at that time, he held many discussions at Ujjain and at Muttra and came to the indisputable conclusion that the Vedāntism of the Hindus and the Sūfī thought among the Muslims were almost identical.⁷⁹ He visited the Gorakhtiri in order to gain some knowledge from the yogis reported to be living there. But he found no yogis there.⁸⁰ Mullā Ahmad Sirhindī refers to an assembly in the month of Ramazān when religious matters were discussed in the presence of Jahāngīr.⁸¹

Hindus in the Public Services

The admission of the Hindus to the higher public services, begun under his father continued. Of forty-seven mansabdārs holding the rank of commanders of 3,000 horses or above, mentioned by Hawkins, six were Hindus.⁸² The position of the Hindus at his court was threatened by the events connected with Khusru's rebellion. Mān Singh, the highest Hindu dignitary in the empire, was suspected of complicity. Raja Rāi Singh of Bikaner actually rebelled during the course of the insurrection. It seems, however, that the Hindus were soon able to remove the Emperor's suspicion. But in Jahāngīr's reign of twenty-two years, we come across only three Hindu governors of provinces, and these served only for short periods. Mān Singh, who was governor of Bengal when Akbar died, was continued in that office.⁸³ Some time after, Raja Kalyān, son of Raja Todar Mall, rose to be the governor of Orissa,⁸⁴ though it is difficult to say whether he was in independent charge of the province.⁸⁵ Raja Vikramājīt served as the governor of Gujarat for some time.⁸⁶ Unfortunately not many appointments of provincial dīwāns are mentioned and we do not know whether or not here the preponderant proportion of the Hindus was disturbed during Jahāngīr's rule.

Indeed Hawkins tells us that Jahāngīr preferred to employ Muslims under him.⁸⁷ Only one Hindu, Mohan Dās, is mentioned as serving as a dīwān under Jahāngīr in the third year.⁸⁸

Social Evils

Jahāngīr made war on certain social evils. The public sale of intoxicants, *bhara* and wine, was forbidden.⁸⁹ No one was allowed to drink wine without permission and Roe records some cases where certain nobles were punished for drinking.⁹⁰ Herein Jahāngīr reversed Akbar's practice of allowing the sale of wine for medicinal purposes and in moderation, and conformed to the Muslim law by prohibiting public sale. But he was a hard drinker himself, and it is difficult to say whether he was any more successful in dealing with the problem than his father had been. The fact that the order prohibiting public sales was issued twice, immediately after his coronation and in the fourth year, proves that, at any rate, the first order might have remained ineffective for some reason. Again he departed from his father's practice and ordered total suppression of public gambling.⁹¹ Here again he followed the Muslim law. The castration of children in Bengal was also forbidden.⁹² He continued his father's disregard of Hindu religious sentiments by prohibiting sati without permission. The burning of child widows, whose marriage had not been consummated, was ordinarily prohibited, though special permission could be granted by the governors.⁹³ In other cases as well permission had to be obtained. This naturally prevented unwilling satis. At Agra the emperor himself decided all these cases.⁹⁴

Court Ceremonies

Some of the ceremonies introduced by Akbar to increase the regal splendour of his court continued. The New Year was celebrated as of old.⁹⁵ Weighing of the emperor

continued.⁹⁶ Jahāngīr had himself weighed during an eclipse in order to ward off evil.⁹⁷ When he was told that some evil was likely to befall Khurram, he had him weighed as a protective measure.⁹⁸ Employment of Hindu astrologers for fixing auspicious hours for most things continued and Muslim nobles took up the fashion and kept Hindu astrologers attached to them.⁹⁹ On the vexed question of the *siyida* Jahāngīr made a compromise. The Mir 'Adals and qāzis were excused Zimīn Bos in the sixth year.¹⁰⁰ Thus the two classes likely to object to the practice on religious grounds were granted exemption. But it was possible to stir up trouble when too orthodox a mullā came to the court, if he refused to perform the *siyida*. We have already seen that Shaikh Ahmad suffered partly on that account. But the reconciliation that took place on his release seems to have been based on Jahāngīr's exempting him from the performance of the *siyida*. Jahāngīr was too anxious to have him with him to subject him to this indignity. Jahāngīr's meeting with another great scholar of his times, Nāsir-ud-Dīn Burhānpurī, bears out the suggestion that Jahāngīr was prepared to allow the same concession to scholars or theologians of eminence as he had granted to the officials of his court. This great scholar was summoned from Burhanpur and met the emperor as he was coming out of the royal garden. He was getting ready to perform the *siyida* when Jahāngīr advanced and embraced him.¹⁰¹

Slaughter of Animals

Jahāngīr continued Akbar's abstention from slaughter of animals twice a week, on Sundays and Thursdays.¹⁰² This was strictly enforced. Guerreiro speaks of the King's visits to the city in order to discover how far his orders were being obeyed. Once he discovered meat being sold on one of these visits. The kotwāl, the officer responsible

for seeing that the royal orders were observed, was called for and flogged.¹⁰³ Soon however he was restored to favour. So strict however was Jahāngīr in enforcing these injunctions that when in the fifth year the 'Īd fell on a Thursday, the sacrificial slaughter of animals was postponed to the following Friday.¹⁰⁴ Now this was not merely a concession to Hindu feelings. These days were sacred as Jahāngīr's day of accession (Thursday) and Akbar's birthday (Sunday night) according to official Muslim reckoning. Safety of life was accorded to all living creatures on those days in order to keep them sacred. Jahāngīr refers to this practice as *Sūfiyāna*, pertaining to the Sūfis.

In Gujarat, Roe describes the slaughter of certain animals being prohibited by royal orders chiefly because rich Jains of the place agreed to pay highly for this concession.¹⁰⁵ Whether the order continued after the expulsion of the Jains is not known.

Cultural Contacts

Jahāngīr continued Akbar's work of bringing the learned of the two communities together by having translations of Hindu sacred books made under his patronage. Two Persian renderings in verse of the *Rāmāyana* were made during his reign. Girdhar Dās, a Kāisith of Delhi, rendered Vālmīkī's *Rāmāyana* into verse, called it *Rām Nāma* and dedicated it to Jahāngīr.¹⁰⁶ Masihi made another Persian translation of the *Rāmāyana* and took pains to prove by inserting a section in praise of the Prophet, that he still remained a Muslim. Jahāngīr asked Sayyid Muhammad to prepare a plain, unvarnished Persian translation of the Qur'ān and send it to the court by his son Jalāl-ud-Dīn.¹⁰⁷ This was probably the first attempt at translating, rather than expounding, the Qur'ān. It had been fashionable to write commentaries on the sacred book, but it was felt a translation was almost an act of profanation, an attempt

at matching the Prophet's own miracle of revelation. Nothing further is heard of this translation and it seems the matter was not further pursued. Sayyid Muhammad was probably the scholar known as Sayyid Muḥammad Maqbūl Khān Ahmādābādī who died in Shāh Jahān's reign early in 1635 leaving a large number of works to his credit.¹⁰⁸ Persian and Arabic translations of the Bible were also presented to Jahāngīr by the Jesuit Fathers.¹⁰⁹

Some of the scholars of Jahāngīr's time acted as a link between the two communities. 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānāna under his Hindi penname of Rahīm wrote all sorts of Hindi verse including many in praise of Hindu gods and a description of the feelings of a devotee towards his God in various incarnations.¹¹⁰ Jahāngīr is said to have patronized Sūr Dās whose *Sūr Sāgar* is reputed to have been compiled under Jahāngīr's patronage who gave one gold coin for every verse of Sūr Dās.¹¹¹

Like Akbar, Jahāngīr continued his patronage of painting, including portrait-painting.¹¹²

Jahāngīr and Islam

(The accounts of European travellers and Christian missionaries at his court throw a good deal of doubt on Jahāngīr's Islam. Coryat makes him a follower of a religion of his own making.¹¹³ Roe speaks of him sometimes as an atheist, sometimes a Hindu in his ceremonies, professing Islam when it was necessary, glad whenever any one broke out against the Prophet.¹¹⁴ Finch makes him declare openly that Christianity was the soundest faith.¹¹⁵ A later Jesuit tradition declared him to be a baptized Christian afraid of openly declaring himself for fear of his son.¹¹⁶ A contemporary Persian writer accused him of being a member of the Dīn-i-Ilāhī.¹¹⁷ Fortunately for Jahāngīr, he could not have been all these things together or

even by turns. His modern critics do him less than justice. Blochmann sought safety in dividing his religious opinions into fits or periods without stopping to inquire whether these periods, by cutting into each other, did not destroy themselves.¹¹⁸ (Dr Beni Prasad blunders into stating that Jahāngīr did not believe in the Prophet.¹¹⁹)

Let us examine these statements. The Jesuits, unaccustomed to religious liberty as they had been in Europe, seem to have been as much dazzled by the toleration granted by Jahāngīr as they had been under Akbar. To them, if a man believed in the truth of a religion, he could only prove it by persecuting the non-believers. If Jahāngīr listened to their statements of the merits of the Christian religion, he lost caste among Muslims. We have already seen that their statements about his conversion are wrong. Jahāngīr maintained intact the Muslim organization of the state in its essential aspects. The Muslim magistrates and judges remained as heretofore in office.¹²⁰ The *sadr-us-sadūr* remained in charge of justice and charities.¹²¹ As we have already seen, he punished heresy and suppressed conversions to Hinduism. He ordered that escheated property should be spent, among other things, on mosques.¹²² In the thirteenth year he gave Shaikh Pir Rs8,000 for building a mosque.¹²³ In the thirteenth year he publicly kept the fast of Ramazan. In the eighth year he walked on foot to Ajmer.¹²⁴ However much he may have indulged in Hindu ceremonies, he rejected the Hindu doctrines of reincarnation and idol-worship.¹²⁵ One of his judges held in 1610 that debts to Christians need not be paid.¹²⁶ When the Roman Catholic Jesuits refused to allow the body of a Protestant Englishman to be buried in their graveyard he insisted on the burial being carried out.¹²⁷ The most that can be said against him is that he hunted wild boars and presented their meat to Rajputs and Christians.¹²⁸

If this is held against him it betrays a gross ignorance of the Muslim attitude towards the question of pigsticking. Pigs are not sacred to Muslims, pork is unlawful to them. The hunting of pigs therefore is not an unlawful act according to Islam.

It is said that in the beginning of his reign Jahāngīr favoured Islam in order to seat himself securely on the throne of Delhi, but thereafter his orthodoxy relaxed. The answer is found in Shāh Jahān's rebellion. When he rebelled, he could very easily have assumed the position of a defender of the true faith. Yet during the whole course of his rebellion, not once did he try to gain any advantage over his father by such a suggestion.¹²⁹ (Naturally, whatever Jahāngīr's personal shortcomings might have been, he was to all intents and purposes, to a majority of his subjects, a good Muslim.) Only a Muslim could have desecrated the temple at Kangra, destroyed idols and temples at Pushkar and in Mewar, upheld the true law by preventing the conversion of Qutub and his companion to Hinduism, stopped the conversion of Muslim girls by marriage to Hindus in Rajauri, ordered a simple translation of the Qur'ān and supported the whole structure of a Muslim kingdom. It is rather strange that, though his subjects had no appreciable fault to find with him, it was left to the contemporary non-Muslims to discover flaws in his profession of Islam.¹³⁰ How much truth there was in their accounts is proved by the fact that all of them assert without truth that Salīm was not circumcized, whereas we have the definite statement of 'Ārif Qandahārī that Salīm had undergone this Muslim rite.¹³¹ They do not stop short even of making him a baptized Christian, without at the same time showing how they overcame the obstacle presented by his vast harem. It seems that the Jesuits were in these matters more concerned with sending in good reports of their labours rather than with truth.

Conclusion

One Muslim contemporary writer complains that matters had become so difficult that no other way was left for honourable men but to leave the country.¹³² Unfortunately he seems to have based his complaints on the fact that under Jahāngīr the Hindus were not kept away like dogs.¹³³

In short, Jahāngīr ordinarily continued Akbar's toleration. He experimented in the simultaneous maintenance of several religions by the state. He did not, in most cases, make any distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims in public employment. He placed no restriction, except in the case of the Jains, on the public celebration of religious fairs and festivals. (With all this, Jahāngīr sometimes acted as protector of the true faith rather than as the king of a vast majority of non-Muslims. Departures, however slight, from Akbar's wide outlook had thus begun.)

NOTES

- 1 Mullā Ahmad, I, 2, 46.
- 2 *ibid.*, I, ii, 26.
- 3 *ibid.*, I, iii, 82.
- 4 Botelho in Hoston: *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, V, 154.
- 5 Payne's translation of Guerreiro's account, 16-23.
- 6 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 146.
- 7 Payne, *op. cit.*, 15.
- 8 Payne, *op. cit.*, 27, 29.
- 9 Payne, *op. cit.*, 72-3.
- 10 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 83.
- 11 *ibid.*, 51.
- 12 *ibid.*, 322.
- 13 *ibid.*, 101.
- 14 *Persian Letters* (Etthe's *Catalogue*, MS. No. 2118), 15-16; *Travels of 'Abdul Latīf*, 35.
- 15 The temple at Muttra was destroyed by Aurangzob and that at Urechha by Shāh Jahān. Lāhaurī: *Badshāhnāma*, II, 121. Lāhaurī mentions the temples that were built but were not completed when Jahāngīr died, I, 451-2.
- 16 *J.P.H.S.*, V, 12, 17, 21.
- 17 Qazvīnī, *Badshāhnāma*, f. 82b; *Tārīkh-i-Haqqī*, 37f.
- 18 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 346-9. *Maāsir-i-Jahāngīrī*, f. 161a.
- 19 Withington in *Early European Travellers to India*, ed. Foster, 223.
- 20 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 125; *Maāsir-i-Jahāngīrī*, f. 98a-98b.
- 21 Cf. also, Lāhaurī, I, 136.
- 22 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 347; Finch in *Early European Travellers to India*, 180.
- 23 Coryat: *Early European Travellers to India*, 269; Sir Thomas Roe: *Embassy to India*, ed. Foster for the Hakluyt Society, 312.
- 24 Mullā Ahmad, I, (2), 45; II, (7), 93.
- 25 *ibid.*, II, (7), 94.
- 26 Terry in *Early European Travellers to India*.
- 27 Roe, *op. cit.*, 316; Withington, *op. cit.*, 223.
- 28 Quoted in Hoston, *op. cit.*, 124.
- 29 Payne, *op. cit.*, 26, 41, 42.
- 30 Payne, *op. cit.*, 2.
- 31 Payne, *op. cit.*, 25.
- 32 Finch, *op. cit.*, 147.
- 33 Roe, *op. cit.*, 315; Hawkins in *Early European Travellers to India*, 86, 116.
- 34 Roe, *op. cit.*, 316.
- 35 *ibid.*, 316.
- 36 Hawkins, *op. cit.*, 84.
- 37 MacLagan, *The Jesuits and the Greater Mogul*, 78.
- 38 *Journal of the Punjab Historical Society*, V, 15.
- 39 Cf. Roe's account of the difficulties experienced by him on account of Muqarrab Khān's opposition.
- 40 MacLagan, *op. cit.*, 77, 78.
- 41 Payne, *op. cit.*, 41, 42.
- 42 Maracci as quoted by MacLagan, *op. cit.*, 98.
- 43 MacLagan, *op. cit.*, 38; Austin of Bordeaux writing on 9 March 1632 declares that Shāh Jahān poisoned Jahāngīr because he was afraid he would become a

- Christian, *J.P.H.S.*, IV, 14. Unfortunately Shāh Jahān was not even near his father at the time of Jahāngīr's death.
- 44 Withington, op. cit., 223; Payne, op. cit., 35: Botelho in Hoston, 153.
- 45 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 35. Mullā Ahmad rejoiced at the killing of 'that kafir of Govindwal'. He declared that he was the leader of the infidels and that his death would serve as a great blow to them. Mullā Ahmad, I, (3), 82.
- 46 Payne, op. cit., XI, 12.
- 47 Sikh tradition, recorded in Macauliffe, III, 90-101.
- 48 Payne, op. cit., XI, 12, Macauliffe, as cited above.
- 49 *Dabistān*, 234; Macauliffe, IV, 10-41. The author of the *Dabistān* knew the seventh guru. His account seems to be more reliable. The Sikh tradition is full of the miracles of the guru.
- 50 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 63, 219.
- 51 *ibid.*, 219.
- 52 *ibid.*, 102.
- 53 Beni Prasad: *Jahāngīr*, 414.
- 54 *ibid.*, 453.
- 55 *Tūzak*, 218.
- 56 *ibid.*, 37.
- 57 Rieu, 1.
- 58 *Tūzak*, 275.
- 59 Rahmān 'Alī, *Ulma-i-Hind*, XI, 12.
- 60 *Tūzak*, 275.
- 61 *ibid.*, 312, 279; Rahmān 'Alī, 12.
- 62 Rahmān 'Alī, op. cit., 12.
- 63 Payne, op. cit., 75.
- 64 Pelsaert, translated by Moreland and Geyl, 75.
- 65 Payne, op. cit., 72.
- 66 *Tūzak-i-Jahāngīrī*, 243.
- 67 *ibid.*, 276.
- 68 *ibid.*, 124.
- 69 *ibid.*, 179.
- 70 *ibid.*, 280, 319.
- 71 *ibid.*, 132.
- 72 Payne, op. cit., 32-3, 46-7, 75.
- 73 Mullā Ahmad, I, (4), 126.
- 74 *Tūzak*, 15.
- 75 Payne, op. cit., 49-56.
- 76 *Tūzak*, 290.
- 77 *ibid.*, 62.
- 78 *ibid.*, 10.
- 79 *Tūzak*, 176, 177, 252, 282-4.
- 80 *ibid.*, 50.
- 81 Mullā Ahmad, III, (9), 100.
- 82 Hawkins, op. cit., 98, 99.
- 83 *Tūzak*, 8.
- 84 *ibid.*, 99.
- 85 Cf. Sri Ram Sharma: *Dengal under Jahāngīr*, *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XIII, Part ii, 69.
- 86 *Tūzak*, 24.
- 87 Hawkins, op. cit., 106-7.
- 88 *Tūzak*, 75.
- 89 *ibid.*, 5, 76.
- 90 Roe, op. cit., 303, 304.
- 91 *Tūzak*, 76.
- 92 *ibid.*, 73.
- 93 Withington, op. cit., 219.
- 94 Hawkins, op. cit., 119; Pelsaert, 78-9; Withington, op. cit., 219.
- 95 *Tūzak*, 23.
- 96 *ibid.*, 79.
- 97 *ibid.*, 183.
- 98 *ibid.*, 56.
- 99 Pelsaert, 77.
- 100 *Tūzak*, 100.
- 101 Rahmān 'Alī, op. cit.
- 102 *Tūzak*, 5, 90.
- 103 Payne, op. cit., 38.
- 104 *Tūzak*, 92.
- 105 Roe, op. cit., 124.
- 106 Cf. the author's description of the work and its date in the

- Islamic Culture*, Hyderabad, October, 1933.
- 107 *Tūzak*, 244-5.
- 108 Cf. Rahmān 'Alī.
- 109 Payne, op. cit., 30-2.
- 110 Cf. *Rahīm Sudhā*, edited by Tripāthī.
- 111 Cf. *Sūr Sāgar*.
- 112 Cf. Brown: *Mughal Paintings*.
- 113 Coryat, op. cit., 147-8.
- 114 Roe, op. cit., I, 157.
- 115 Finch, op. cit., 147-8.
- 116 MacLagan, op. cit., 92.
- 117 *Tazkirat-ul-Malūk*, 567.
- 118 Blochmann in *Calcutta Review*, 1869, 139-40.
- 119 Beni Prasad: *Jahāngīr*, 431.
- 120 *Tūzak*, 100.
- 121 *Tūzak* mentions Sadr-i-Jahān as Jahāngīr's first sadr-us-sadūr (page 22) Rahmān 'Alī describes Mullā Taqī as his sadr-us-sadūr. Musāwī Khān was his last sadr-us-sadūr, Lāhaurī, I, 181.
- 122 *Tūzak*, 5.
- 123 *ibid.*, 119.
- 124 *ibid.*, 125; Coryat, op. cit., 280.
- 125 *Tūzak*, 15.
- 126 Finch, op. cit., 147.
- 127 Payne, op. cit., 81.
- 128 Roe, op. cit., 105, 157, 284; Coryat, op. cit., 281.
- 129 Cf. Shāh Jahān's letter to Jahāngīr in *Munshiat*, quoted by the present writer in *An Unexplored Source of Mughal History*. Lāhaurī, Shāh Jahān's official historian accuses Jahāngīr of wasting Akbar's treasure, leaving the work of the state to the governors and officials or to Nūr Jahān but he casts no doubt on Jahāngīr's religion. Lāhaurī, II, 148, 475, 713.
- 130 Roe, op. cit., 313; Coryat, op. cit., 246.
- 131 *Tārīkh-i-Muhammad* 'Arif Qanduhārī, MS., 270. The present writer described the only known fragment of this work for the first time in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, October, 1933.
- 132 Mullā Ahmad, I, (2), 45.
- 133 *ibid.*, I, (3), 43.

Chapter IV

SHĀH JAHĀN

His Accession

With the accession of Shāh Jahān, the Mughal empire entered upon a new phase. (If Akbar was liberal in his religious views and Jahāngīr indifferent to nicer questions of theology, Shāh Jahān was an orthodox Muslim. Although born of a Rajput mother to a father whose mother was also a Rajput princess, Shāh Jahān does not seem to have been much influenced by these factors.) He was thirty-six at the time of his accession and thus old enough to chalk out a policy for himself. He was a favourite of his grandfather, Akbar, and his early education was no doubt carried on under liberal teachers of Sūfist leanings.¹ But Akbar died when Shāh Jahān was only twelve. We have to remember further that though he was his grandfather's favourite, there did not seem to be much chance of his occupying the Mughal throne during his grandfather's lifetime as he was not his eldest grandson. Because of this he must have been educated as an ordinary Mughal prince rather than a future emperor. But towards the end of Akbar's reign, intrigues on behalf of Khusru increased the status of Khurram. Early in Jahāngīr's reign we find Khurram appointed the President of the Council of Regency formed by Jahāngīr when he left the capital in pursuit of his rebel son in April, 1606. This was followed by a more formal recognition of his new position in 1607. From then till his rebellion in 1622, Shāh Jahān remained basking in his father's favour as a likely successor. The years that followed his defeat and reconciliation with Jahāngīr did not bring the father and the son much closer together. Shāh Jahān did not,

however, raise the standard of 'Islam in danger' against his father, and when he succeeded him in 1627, he had no religious commitments. There is one significant fact, however, to be noticed in his early career. Unlike his father and grandfather, he married no Hindu princess, and thus that mellowing influence was lacking in his harem.

Court Ceremonies

On his accession, the court ceremonies attracted his attention first. The mode of salutation in the court by *sijida* had been common, though not compulsory, under Akbar. Under Jahāngīr, the religious officers, the qāzīs, the Mīr 'Adals, and the sadrs were exempt from paying respects to the emperor in that fashion. Shāh Jahān carried the modification still further. *Sijida* was abolished forthwith as it involved prostration which, according to the Islamic traditions, is due to God alone.² But this did not produce any change in the court etiquette. The Zamīnbos form of salutation that was still allowed was no better. Shāh Jahān's orthodoxy at last resulted in abolishing both these humiliating forms of salutation in 1636-37 (1046 A.H.)³ and in their place 'Chahār Taslīm' was made current. This involved bowing and touching one's forehead, eyes and arms four times. Even this was against the Muslim usage. There seems to have ensued a conflict between imperial grandeur and orthodoxy. The former won, but to the latter a point was conceded. The 'Chahār Taslīm' remained the court ceremony of salutation, but an exception was made in favour of the theologians of various degrees. They were excused 'Chahār Taslīm' and were to salute the emperor by using the common Muslim formula of 'wishing peace'.⁴ It is probable however that the unorthodox practice of raising hands in salutation was not discontinued even in their case. The 'Chahār Taslīm' however soon assumed a form which made it difficult to distinguish it from the *Sijida*.

Manucci thus describes it: 'I arose, stood quite erect, and bending my body very low until my head was quite close to the ground, I placed my right hand with its back to the ground, then raising it, put it on my head, and stood up straight. This ceremonial I repeated three times.'⁵ As Manucci himself notes further on, this had to be done four times.

(Shāh Jahān was anxious to give his court a Muslim atmosphere. All the Muslim festivals were regularly celebrated with imperial grandeur.) Rs70,000 a year was set apart for distribution in charities, Rs30,000 was given away during the month of Ramazān, Rs10,000 was distributed during the months of Muharram, Rajab, Sha'bān and Rabī'-ul-Awal.⁶ These festivals were court festivals; Hindus and Muslims alike attended them, made presents to the emperor who, in his turn, gave gifts to the amīrs. The 'Īds and Shab-i-Barāts were occasions of great rejoicings. Raja Jaswant Singh and Raja Jai Singh were both given an elephant each on the occasion of the 'Īd in the twelfth year.⁷ Rs500,000 were set apart to be sent to Mecca in instalments. Occasionally a royal Mīr-i-Haj was appointed to take these offerings and serve as the leader of the pilgrims going to Mecca.⁸ When Sayyid Jalāl Gujarātī was appointed the *sadr-us-sadūr* in 1642, he was raised to the rank of a *mansabdār* over 4,000 men. Soon, however, he became a commander of 6,000 men.⁹ This naturally increased the influence of the theologians at court. Never before had such a high status been combined with this sacerdotal office. It is not surprising therefore, to find that annalists and poets sing of Shāh Jahān's piety and love of Islam.

In other ways too, Shāh Jahān acted as the champion of the true faith, the Sunni variety of Islam. When he dispatched a mission to Qutb-ul-Mulk of Golconda in 1635-36 (1045 A.H.), he definitely proclaimed himself ordained by God, not only as the leader of the Sunnis but

the destroyer of all those who did not conform to his ideas of Islam.¹⁰ Hard pressed by the Mughal armies, Qutb-ul-Mulk had to proclaim himself a Sunnī, and inaugurate Sunnī rites in his state, before he was able to obtain respite from the imperial forces.¹¹ In 1629-30 (1039 A.H.) Shāh Jahān suppressed what he considered heretical practices among the Afghans.¹² The Muslim creed continued to be stamped on the coins as in Jahāngīr's¹³ time.

In certain other matters Shāh Jahān continued the old practices. He sat daily in the salutation balcony, even though to his more orthodox son and successor, Aurangzeb, it smacked of worship of man instead of God. In order to make it more comfortable for his subjects to see him there, he caused roofs to be set up in the court yards below the salutation balconies in Agra, Delhi and Lahore.¹⁴ He continued the customary annual ceremony of Tulā Dān, weighing himself against different commodities and giving them away. He kept astrologers at court. He was a patron of painting, even of portrait-painting, and many great paintings of his court are still preserved. But he discontinued the practice of allowing favoured nobles the honour of wearing the imperial likeness in their turban. He is said to have discontinued the use of the Ilāhī calendar, but documents of his reign are in existence bearing the Ilāhī dates.¹⁵ The *'Amal-i-Sālīh* almost always gives both the Ilāhī and the Hijrī dates. The *Bādshāhnāma* of Lāhaurī frequently uses the Ilāhī calendar. The custom of weighing the emperor twice according to the lunar and solar reckoning involved the use of the Ilāhī calendar. The fact, that Aurangzeb had to discontinue the use of the Ilāhī calendar in the revenue and accounts departments,¹⁶ proves that under Shāh Jahān it had been retained in use. It seems that Shāh Jahān instituted the practice of having his official chronicles drawn up according to the Ilāhī calendar and one of his annual New Year Day parties was

held according to the same reckoning. But he introduced another innovation in the time schedule of his day. He changed the traditional division of day and night according to the rising and the setting of the sun to an equal division of time between the day and the night.¹⁷

The emperors used to make the *tikā* sign on the forehead of the Hindu Rajas when they acceded to their titles. Shāh Jahān, though he would not discontinue it, delegated this task to his Prime Minister.¹⁸ Music and dancing remained in fashion at the court and the emperor kept court musicians who sang daily at regular intervals.

Public Services

As far as the public services were concerned Shāh Jahān started by issuing rather a tall order. It was decided that only Muslims were to be recruited to the public services.¹⁹ But this order does not seem to have been enforced. In the thirty-first year there were fifty-two Hindus, from a total of two hundred and forty-one, serving as mansabdārs over 1,000 to 7,000.²⁰ At the end of the tenth year there were 189 mansabdārs of 1,000 and above. Of this number 35 were Hindus.²¹ At the end of the twentieth year out of a total of 231 living mansabdārs of 1,000 and above, 51 were Hindus.²² The total increase in these ten years was 42 of which the number of the Hindus was sixteen. Thus whereas the percentage of the Hindus at the end of the tenth year was only 18·5 of the total strength, they secured 38 per cent of the new creations. Towards the end of the reign, however, the percentage of the Hindus seems to have gone down. Though the strength of the cadre rose from 231 at the end of the twentieth year to 241 at the end of the thirty-first year, the number of Hindus rose to 52 only. Even then the percentage of the Hindus stood at 21·5 instead of 18·5 as at the end of the tenth year. If we include the number of the mansabdārs of 500 and

above, the position revealed is almost the same. At the end of the tenth year, the number of the Hindu mansabdārs of 500 and above was 76 out of a total of 419.²³ At the end of the twentieth year there were 97 Hindus out of a total of 453.²⁴ The Hindus thus secured 21 out of 34 new creations.

An examination of the list of the Hindu mansabdārs at the end of the twentieth year yields very interesting results. Here are the names of the mansabdārs of 1,000 and above.

COMMANDERS OF 5,000

1. Raja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur.
2. Raja Jagat Singh of Udaipur.
3. Raja Jai Singh of Jaipur.
4. Raja Bithal Dās Gaur.

COMMANDERS OF 4,000

5. Raja Rāi Singh, son of the late Maharaja Bhīm Singh (of the house of the rulers of Mewar).

COMMANDERS OF 3,000

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 6. Raja Pahār Singh Bundelā of Urchha. | |
| 7. Rāo Satārsāl Hāda of Bundi. | |
| 8. Mādho Singh Hāda (uncle of the above). | |
| 9. Udāji Rām. | } All from South India. |
| 10. Parsoji Bhonsla. | |
| 11. Jādu Rāi. | |
| 12. Mankoji Nimbalkar. | |
| 13. Rāwat Rai. | |
| 14. Dattārji. | |

COMMANDERS OF 2,500

15. Raja Devī Singh Bundelā.

COMMANDERS OF 2,000

16. Raja Rājṛūp of Nūrpur (in the Punjab).
17. Rāo Karn Bhurtya of Bikāner.
18. Raja Jairāmdās Bārgojār.
19. Prithvī Rāj Rāthor.
20. Rūp Singh Rāthor.
21. Rām Singh Rāthor (a cousin of the Rānā).
22. Patoji. }
23. Arīrāi. } All from South India.
24. Babaji. }

COMMANDERS OF 1,500

25. Rāwal Punja of Dongarpur.
26. Ratan Rāthor.
27. Rāo Rūp Singh Chandrāwat.
28. Chand Ratan Bundelā.
29. Sujān Singh Sissodia.
30. Rāi Todar Mall (Dīwan).
31. Anarōdh. }
32. Shivrām. } Sons of Raja Bithal Dās Gaur.
33. Raibā Dakhannī.

COMMANDERS OF 1,000

34. Rāwal Samarsī of Banswara.
35. Raja Gursen of Kishtwar, Kashmir.
36. Raja Prithī Chand of Chamba.
37. Raja Badan Singh Bhadorya.
38. Kanwar Rām Singh (son of Raja Jai Singh of Jaipur).
39. Gopāl Singh Kachhwāhā.
40. Pratāp.
41. Girdhar Dās Gaur.
42. Rāi Singh, cousin of Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur.
43. Arjun, son of Bithal Dās.
44. Rāi Singh Jhālā.

45. Raja Amar Singh.
46. Bhojrāj Dakhanī.
47. Rāi Kāshī Dās (*a provincial diwān*).
48. Rāi Dayānat Rāi (*accounts department*).
49. Rāi Bhār Māl (*a provincial diwān*).
50. Mahesh Dās Rāthor.
51. Raja Trilok Chand Kachhwāhā.

Out of these 51, numbers 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 25, 35, 36, 37, and 38 (in all 13) were ruling chiefs. Raja Bithal Dās Gaur was himself a commander of 5,000. One of his sons was a commander of 1,000, and two commanders of 2,000. Rāi Todar Mall, Rāi Kāshī Dās, Rāi Dayānat Rāi and Rāi Bhār Māl represented the revenue and accounts departments. A very interesting element is the strength of the Deccanese officers who held eleven commands among themselves. They represent probably the price of the policy of expansion in South India which Shāh Jahān had pursued for several years. The rest are chiefly Rajputs belonging to the various ruling houses in Rajputana and elsewhere. The diwāns seem to have risen from the ranks.

In the revenue department besides the four provincial diwāns ranking as commanders of 1,000 or more, there were others occupying less exalted stations yet discharging equally responsible duties. Rāi Sobhā Chand was the diwān of Lahore in the twelfth year.²⁵ Rāi Mukand Dās was a Diwān-i-Tan and Diwān-i-Bayūtāt. He served for some time as the officiating revenue minister in the twelfth year.²⁶ Rāi Dayānat Rāi, who was a commander of 1,000, became the diwān of all the Mughal territories in the Deccan.²⁷ Benī Dass served as the diwān of Bihar.²⁸ Rāi Raghū Nāth officiated for some time as the imperial finance minister,²⁹ whereas Rāi Chandar Bhān was officer-in-charge of the Dār-ul-Inshā, the Secretariat.³⁰ Probably the most interesting appointment of the reign was that of Shāhji

whom Shāh Jahān tempted into imperial service by conferring on him the highest command, 6,000.³¹ He does not seem to have actually joined the Mughals. Yet the appointment is significant as he was appointed to a rank higher than that of any other Hindu mansabdār. We further find that on the outbreak of the War of Succession, Mahārājā Jaswant Singh was the premier noble of the empire,³² holding the rank of a commander of 6,000. Thus under Shāh Jahān Hindus occupied a higher status in the government than that occupied by the Indians today. They counted among them the mightiest subject and the highest public servant, the imperial finance minister and several provincial ministers of finance, besides several military commanders of great fame.

When Aurangzeb was the Viceroy of the Deccan, Shāh Jahān sharply reprimanded him for his anti-Rajput bias.³³ In one case the record keeper of the salaries office, Rāi Māyā Dās, was replaced by a Muslim probably on account of his religion, though the court annalist would have us believe it was old age which necessitated his removal.³⁴ On the whole, however, one may hold that no dislodgment of Hindus from the public services seems to have taken place.

Pilgrimage Tax

(Shāh Jahān did not reimpose the jizya but tried to make money out of the religious convictions of the Hindus in other ways. The pilgrimage tax was revived.³⁵) It was a heavy burden and an obstacle in the way of the Hindus who wanted to fulfil their religious injunctions. On the importunity of a Hindu scholar of Benares, Kavindarācārya, who led a deputation to the emperor against this hateful imposition, the emperor remitted it and thus allowed his Hindu subjects religious liberty.³⁶

Religious Places of non-Muslims

Shāh Jahān changed the spirit of religious toleration, that had characterized the Mughal government so far, in several other ways as well. (To begin with, the emperor forbade the completion of certain temples that had been started during his predecessor's reign. Repairs to old temples were prohibited and the building of new temples was forbidden.³⁷) But Shāh Jahān was not satisfied with these orders alone. He embarked on a campaign of complete destruction of the new temples of the Hindus. Three temples were destroyed in Gujarat, seventy-two temples in Benares and its neighbourhood, and probably four temples elsewhere in the province of Allahabad.³⁸ Some temples in Kashmir were also sacrificed to the religious fury of the emperor. The Hindu temple of Ichchhabal was destroyed and converted into a mosque.³⁹ This betokened a rather serious fit of religious frenzy which Akbar's reign seemed to have made impossible. The materials of some of the Hindu temples were used for building mosques.⁴⁰

In the ninth year a magnificent temple built by Bīr Singh Bundelā at Urchha was destroyed during the course of the military operations against Jujuhār Singh Bundelā.⁴¹ Several other temples suffered the same fate or were converted into mosques. When the fort of Khata Kheri was conquered and taken from its Bhil ruler Bhāgīrath in 1632, Muslim rites were performed there⁴² just as had happened in the temple of Kangra on its conquest by Jahāngīr. The fort of Dhamuni under Jujuhār Singh was similarly desecrated in 1644-45 (1045 A.H.).⁴³ Earlier, in 1630-31 (1040 A.H.) when Abdāl, the Hindu chief of Hargāon in the province of Allahabad, rebelled, most of the temples in the state were either demolished or converted into mosques. Idols were burnt.^{43a} Prince Aurangzeb while Viceroy of Gujarat (February, 1645 to January, 1647)

was responsible for the demolition of several temples. In Ahmedabad and elsewhere many temples were destroyed, among them being the temple of Khāndai Rāi at Satara, and the temple of Chintāman close to Sarashpur. Probably after Aurangzeb's departure in 1647, many of these temples were again taken possession of by the Hindus.⁴⁴

Shāh Jahān thus reverted to the practice of systematically desecrating the religious shrines of rebel chiefs and enemies. He also tried to enforce the Muslim injunction against any new place of worship being built by non-believers. But it seems that his fury did not last long. Though in general terms some of the chroniclers of the reign remember the emperor as the destroyer of temples, no more specific cases find mention in the later part of his reign. Something seems to have softened the emperor and the fit of religious frenzy soon passed away.

Probably due to Dārā's increasing influence we find Shāh Jahān reversing this policy some time after. The prince presented a stone railing to the temple of Kesho Rāi at Muttra.⁴⁵ A letter written during the year 1643-44 (1053 A.H.) to Jai Singh, Raja of Jaipur, conceded him full liberty to appoint the presiding priest at the temple of Bindrabān built by Mān Singh.⁴⁶ Mān Singh's mother had died in Bengal and by a letter dated August 1639, Shāh Jahān granted two hundred *bīghas* of land to be attached to her mausoleum in order to ensure its perpetual upkeep.⁴⁷ The restoration of their temples to the Hindus of Gujarat, however, took place after 1647.

The Christians themselves brought about the destruction of some of their religious privileges. The Jesuits at the Mughal court had been mixing politics with religion and they had little to complain about when on the outbreak of hostilities with the Portuguese at Hooghly, Shāh Jahān ordered the dismantling of their church at Agra and the destruction of their church images. He allowed them,

however, the right to hold their religious ceremonies in the houses they were permitted to retain.⁴⁸

(Thus Shāh Jahān interfered with open public worship in the Christian fashion in churches, allowing Christians, however, to hold religious ceremonies in the privacy of their own houses.) We have to remember that, unlike the Protestant and Roman Catholic governments of Europe during the religious wars and after, the Mughals seldom tried to interfere with the privacy of their subjects in religious matters. The rights enjoyed by the Roman Catholics in India, even after this eruption, far exceeded those enjoyed by their religious brethren in Protestant England about this time and even later.

Conversions to Other Religions

(Shāh Jahān also stopped the prevailing practice of allowing the Hindus and the Christians to make converts to their religions.) The permission granted to Christians was withdrawn as the result of the war against the Portuguese. Christians had never been able to convert a large number of Hindus and Muslims to their faith. Their efforts had mainly been confined to keeping within the Christian faith such Armenians, Europeans and others of similar faith who happened to take service at the Mughal court. Before the establishment of the Jesuit Missions at Agra and Lahore, the Christians entering the Mughal service usually adopted non-Christian modes of life from which they were rescued by the Jesuit missionaries. Now that the missionaries were established at Agra and Lahore, such cases became rare. The refusal of the permission, therefore, was simply the denial of a principle and implied Shāh Jahān's anxiety to conform to the Muslim theological injunctions rather than create practical obstacles in the path of the Christian missions. In the case of the Hindus, however, it was otherwise. They had been actually absorbing a number of

Muslims by conversion to Hinduism. In the sixth year of his reign when Shāh Jahān was returning from Kashmir through Jammu, he discovered, as Jahāngīr had discovered before him, that the Hindus of Bhadauri and Bhimbar accepted daughters of Muslim parents and converted them to their own faith. These women were cremated at their death according to Hindu rites. Jahāngīr had tried to stop this practice but to no avail. Shāh Jahān not only issued orders making such marriages unlawful henceforward, but ordered that these converted Muslim girls be taken away from their husbands, who in turn were to be fined. They could escape the fine if they accepted Islam. So widespread was this practice of converting Muslim girls to Hinduism that these orders discovered more than 4,000 such women.⁴⁹

During the course of the same journey Shāh Jahān came across the same source of uneasiness to his orthodoxy in Gujarat. Here again some seventy such converts were discovered. This gave the emperor cause for anxiety. General orders were issued to scour the Punjab and put down these practices by force. Four hundred cases were further reported in consequence.⁵⁰

In his tenth year Shāh Jahān discovered that his orders had not completely stopped this system of conversion to Hinduism. Dalpat, a Hindu of Sirhind, had converted a Muslim girl, Zinab, given her the Hindu name, Gangā, and brought up their children as Hindus. He had also converted one Muslim boy and six Muslim girls to Hinduism. The emperor was now exasperated by this persistence and defiance of his orders. To put a stop to this practice and warn all future transgressors against the law, Dalpat's wife and children were taken away from him. He was sentenced to death by dismemberment with the option that he could save himself by becoming a Muslim. Dalpat however was made of the stuff of which martyrs are made and he flatly refused the offer. He was cruelly done to death.⁵¹

Another probable source of conversion to Hinduism was also stopped. Though Akbar had discontinued the practice of making slaves of the prisoners of war, it seems to have been too deep-rooted to disappear so easily. It had now revived. These slaves were publicly sold to bidders or retained by the soldiers. Shāh Jahān now issued an order that Muslim prisoners of war were not to be sold to the Hindus as slaves. Hindu soldiers were also forbidden from enslaving Muslims.⁵²

After his tenth year however Shāh Jahān seems to have left the proselytizing activities of the Hindus alone. During the rest of his reign we do not hear of any attempts to put down the efforts of the Hindus to make converts to their religion. This did not mean that these activities had been finally crushed. We come across several cases of the conversion of Muslims by the Hindus. There was a Hindu saint, Kalyān Bhāti, living in Kiratpur, in the year 1643. He was a *sanyasi* who had travelled to far off Persia where he had been converted to Islam. When he returned to India, he became a Hindu and was accepted as a religious leader by the Hindus. It is said that the licentious life of Shah Abbās Safavi of Persia (1583 to 1628) had disgusted him.⁵³

A large number of Muslims were converted to Hinduism by the Vairagīs. The author of the *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib* speaks of these conversions as if from his own personal knowledge. Two Muslim nobles are mentioned among these converts, Mirzā Sālih and Mirzā Haidar.⁵⁴

When the Sikh guru, Hargōbind, took up his residence at Kiratpur, in the Punjab, he succeeded in converting a large number of Muslims some time before 1645. In the words of *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib*, not a Muslim was left between the hills near Kiratpur and the frontiers of Tibet and Khotan.⁵⁵ The Mughals conquered Kiratpur in 1645 and it is possible they might have made some efforts at reconverting the

people. But the Muslim chroniclers are silent about the fate of any such attempt.

Conversions to Islam

Though persecution for such mal-practices may have come to an end, proselytizing activity seems to have continued throughout Shāh Jahān's reign. Early in his reign Shāh Jahān had appointed a Superintendent of Converts to Islam, thus setting up a department for the special purpose of making converts.⁵⁶ This solicitude for increasing the number of the Muslims was accompanied by various measures calculated to effect this end. The one common enough practice was to make terms with the criminals. Any crime could be expiated if a man was willing enough to become a Muslim. The Hindus of the Punjab, Bhimbar, Bhadauri and Sirhind, who were guilty of the offence of abetting apostacy, were all offered remission of their sentences provided they accepted the 'true faith'. When the war with the Portuguese started, many of them were made prisoners and condemned to slavery or death. But they too were offered their freedom and life if they accepted the 'true faith'.⁵⁷ Of the four hundred who were brought before the emperor, very few, however, accepted the offer, the rest were imprisoned but orders were issued that whenever they should express their willingness to be converted they should be liberated and given daily allowances.⁵⁸ The Hindu law confined rights in the property of a joint family to the Hindus alone. Naturally, if a Hindu was converted to Islam he lost his right in the joint property. Like Lord Dalhousie two centuries later, Shāh Jahān could not tolerate this artificial obstacle to the spread of the 'true faith', and an order was issued in the seventh year of his reign that if a Hindu wanted to be converted to Islam, his family should not place any obstacles in his way.⁵⁹ Most probably this refers to the threats of depriving the

'renegade' of his share of the joint property. But Shāh Jahān's order differed to a great extent from Lord Dalhousie's legislation. Dalhousie, by allowing Christian converts to claim their share of the joint property, brought conversion to and from Christianity to the same level. No law entailed the confiscation of his property on a Christian if he became a Hindu. Thus Dalhousie's order established no inequalities. But under Shāh Jahān, apostacy from Islam had again become a capital crime. His orders, therefore, made conversions from among the Hindus easier, and gave the state full power for keeping Muslims true to their faith.

It is no wonder that this led to forcible conversion in times of war. When Shujā' was appointed governor of Kabul, his assumption of office was accompanied by a ruthless war in the Hindu territory beyond the Indus. Shankar was the ruler of these tribes. (During the war, sixteen sons and dependents of Hāthī were converted by force. The sword of Islam further yielded a crop of 5,000 new converts. Hindu temples were converted into mosques. Anyone showing signs of reverting to the faith of his forefathers was executed.⁶⁰) The rebellion of Jujhār Singh yielded a rich crop of Muslim converts, mostly minors. His young son Durgā and his grandson Durjan Sāl were both converted to become Imām Qulī and 'Ali Qulī.⁶¹ Udai Bhān, his eldest son, when captured, preferred death to Islam. Another son who was a minor was however converted. Most of the women had burnt themselves to death but such as were captured—probably slave girls or maids—were converted and distributed among Muslim mansabdārs.⁶² When Pratāp Ujjainya rebelled in the tenth year, one of his women was captured, converted to Islam,⁶³ and married to a grandson of Fīroz Jang.⁶⁴ The conquest of Beglana was followed by the conversion of Nāharjī's son and successor who now became Daulatmand.⁶⁵

Nasrat Jang converted a Brahman boy to Islam who, however, seemed to have resented it and killed his 'benefactor' while he lay asleep.⁶⁶

There was a severe famine in the Punjab in 1645-46 (1055 A.H.) when people began to sell their children. Shāh Jahān ordered that the sale price be paid by the state and the Muslim children be restored to their parents.⁶⁷ Hindu children bought in this way, by the state, were probably brought up as Muslims.

It is not surprising, therefore, that some noteworthy converts were made during this reign. Raja Rāj Singh's son Bakhtāwar Singh and his grandson were converted.⁶⁸ One Guru Kishan of Amroha, however, does not seem to have been suitably rewarded on his conversion and had to remind the emperor of his services in becoming a Muslim and solicit a mansab, in order to make this an inducement to others.⁶⁹ Sri Ranga III of the Carnatic was attacked by 'Adil Khān. Pressed in from all sides he was promised safety on the renunciation of his religion and conversion to Islam.⁷⁰

Shāh Jahān discovered other means of swelling the ranks of the Muslims. When Hindu princesses were married to the Mughal kings and princes, they do not seem to have been formally converted to the true faith. It is true that their marriage in itself constituted an act of conversion. But Akbar seems to have allowed these princesses a good deal of religious liberty and Jahāngīr does not appear to have changed the practice of his father very much. Under Shāh Jahān, however, the Muslim law was more strictly followed. The princesses were first formally converted to Islam, the emperor himself teaching them the elements of the Muslim religion on their entry into the palace.⁷¹ Marriage was solemnized after this formal conversion.

Thus Shāh Jahān took active steps not only for stopping the conversion of the Muslims to other faiths but for swelling their number by all possible means as well. Herein he

earned the praises of almost all the Muslim annalists of his reign and came to be regarded as a great Muslim king, anxious to restore the lost privileges of Islam.

Blasphemy

As Shāh Jahān made apostacy criminal, he took similar measures to enforce the Muslim penal code in connexion with other religious crimes as well. Blasphemy was once again made a criminal offence. A Hindu who was alleged to have behaved disrespectfully towards the Qur'ān was executed.⁷² Chhaila, a Brahman and provincial qānūngo of Berar, lost his head because he was similarly accused of disrespectful language towards the Prophet.⁷³ Rājū, a Sayyid holding heretic views, was first expelled from Ahmedabad and subsequently killed on his opposing the imperial officers sent in order to accomplish and hasten his departure, during the viceroyalty of Aurangzeb.⁷⁴

Sumptuary Laws

The Muslim tradition further laid down that it was the duty of a Muslim king to see that the Hindus were not allowed to look like the Muslims. This naturally demanded the promulgation of sumptuary laws. Shāh Jahān took a step towards reviving them by ordering that the Hindus be not allowed to dress like the Muslims.⁷⁵ No serious attempt seems to have been made to enforce this regulation as no *mukhtasibs* were appointed to look after the enforcement of these orders.

In his sixth year Shāh Jahān prohibited the sale, public or private, of wine.⁷⁶ Jahāngīr had only prohibited public sales. This order therefore involved the extension of the prohibition to private sales as well. Christians, however, were allowed to manufacture their own drinks⁷⁷ when it was discovered that going without drinks made them inefficient

gunners. This order does not seem to have been of much use in reducing drinking.

Shāh Jahān's attitude towards the prohibition of the slaughter of animals as practised by Akbar and Jahāngīr was again that of an orthodox Muslim. (He himself had no leanings towards Sūfism though his son Dārā was a Sūfī.) Naturally the prohibition of the slaughter of animals on certain days of the week as enforced by Akbar and Jahāngīr was discontinued. But the respect Akbar and Jahāngīr had shown towards Hindu feelings by prohibiting the slaughter of certain animals continued to some extent in certain areas. Manrique discovered that in Bengal the killing of animals held sacred by the Hindus was a crime punished by amputation of a limb. He was able, however, to compound for it by paying a fine and spirit away the culprit after he had been whipped.⁷⁸ It is reasonable to suppose that these prohibitions were not confined to the districts visited by Manrique alone and that elsewhere as well such respect was shown to Hindu feelings.

Cultural Contacts

Thanks probably to Dārā, Shāh Jahān continued the policy of his predecessors in another important field. Dārā's Sūfist leanings led him to explore the depths of Hindu religion and under his patronage and partly by his own efforts several Sanskrit works were translated into Persian. These included the famous 'song celestial', *Bhagavad Gītā*, *Yoga Vāsistha*, and *Prabodhacandrodaya*. He himself translated the *Upanishads* and declared them to be the 'book' referred to in the Qur'ān. He further wrote a tract comparing the Vedantist terms with Sūfist expressions proving thereby that both came very near each other. He definitely set out to prove by these efforts of his that the Hindus deserved toleration not because it was politic even for the Muslim emperors of India to show them this

concession, but because Islam enjoined such toleration to Hinduism as a kindred faith.⁷⁹ A translation of the *Rāmāyana* was also made by a Hindu scholar.

More important however was the patronage of Hindu poets by Shāh Jahān. Sunder Dās and Chintāmanī were two great Hindi poets of the age who received court patronage.⁸⁰ They wrote on various themes, including religious topics.

Shāh Jahān's reign is famous for the quality and the quantity of the Sanskrit writings that it produced. The great jurist, Kamalākar Bhatta, author of the famous *Nirṇayasindhu*, was alive. One of Shāh Jahān's protégés, Kavindarācārya, wrote a commentary on the *Rigveda*. Jagannāth, who was a court poet, besides compiling poetic works singing the praises of Dārā, and Āsaf Khān, wrote religious tracts in praise of the Ganges, the Yamunā and the Sun. Nityānanda who was patronized by Āsaf Khān wrote two works on Hindu astronomy. Vedāngarāja, another protégé of Shāh Jahān, compiled in Sanskrit a vocabulary of Persian and Arabic terms used in Indian astronomy and astrology. Mitramisra, the famous jurist whose interpretations of the Hindu law are still upheld by the High Courts of Calcutta and Bombay, was also living during Shāh Jahān's reign.⁸¹

Conclusion

(To sum up, then, Shāh Jahān was a more orthodox king than his two predecessors. During the sixth to the tenth years of his reign he embarked upon the active career of a persecuting king. Several orders were issued during these years for the purpose of achieving his end.) New temples were destroyed, conversions were stopped, several Hindus were persecuted for religious reasons, and probably the pilgrimage tax was reimposed. Soon (however his religious zeal seems to have spent itself. (Probably as Dārā's influence at court increased, Shāh Jahān's ardour as a great

proselytizing king cooled down when he discovered in the heir-apparent, and his deputy in many state affairs, a religious toleration equalling that of his grandfather Akbar. Of course the discontinuance of certain court ceremonies which smacked of Hindu practices was permanent. Yet he continued the use of the Ilāhī year even in his *farmāns* and in revenue accounts. His royal mandates still began with *Alla hu Akbar* made popular by Akbar. He continued patronizing dancing, music, portrait painting and astrology. The ceremony of weighing the emperor against different commodities was performed every year amidst the applause of the court poets and annalists.

But as a pious Muslim, Shāh Jahān showed greater interest in the celebration of Muslim festivals as state ceremonies. Larger amounts were given in charity to Muslims on these occasions. The gulf between the state and the orthodoxy was partially bridged by the increasing importance attached to the office of the *sadr-us-sadūr* and by the appointment of an officer to look after new converts and possibly to encourage conversions to Islam. Shāh Jahān tried to convert his court into that of a great Muslim emperor. Frequent missions were sent to Mecca in charge of the pilgrims as also for the distribution of the charities set apart by the emperor. It is rather interesting to note that the larger part of Shāh Jahān's gifts to Mecca was sent in the shape of merchandise which was sold in Arabia and the proceeds given in charity. His letters to Qutb-ul-Mulk of Golkanda portray him as the champion of the Sunnī variety of Islam.

It is, thus, not wholly true to say that Shāh Jahān's reign was a prelude to what followed under Aurangzeb. Much of what his successor did constituted a vote of censure on Shāh Jahān for failing to do, in its entirety, what the Muslim law and tradition demanded of a Muslim king. It is true the five years, from the sixth to the tenth, of his reign gave

the Hindus a foretaste of what might happen if the Mughal throne happened to be filled by an orthodox king who insisted on following in their entirety the contemporary Muslim practices. Shāh Jahān however—despite the praises showered on him by his court poets and annalists—was never consistently or for long a persecutor. (Towards the end of his reign, we actually find him restraining the religious zeal of Aurangzeb and overriding him in many important matters. It must, however, be admitted that Akbar's ideal of a 'comprehensive state' although, only partially, was gradually being lost sight of.)

NOTES

- 1 Sālih, I, 30-2.
- 2 Lāhaurī, I, i, 110.
- 3 Khāfi Khān, I, 540; Lāhaurī, I, i, 112.
- 4 Lāhaurī, I, i, 3; I, i, 222-3.
- 5 Manucci, I, 87-8.
- 6 Lāhaurī, II, 114; I, i, 196, 200, 204, 252, 539.
- 7 ibid., II, 144.
- 8 ibid., I, i, 306-7.
- 9 ibid., II, 718.
- 10 Khāfi Khān, I, 518.
- 11 ibid., I, 533.
- 12 ibid., I, 423, 424.
- 13 ibid., I, 397.
- 14 Lāhaurī, I, i, 222-3.
- 15 Khāfi Khān, I, 7; Lāhaurī, I, i, 128-9; *J.P.H.S.*, V, 26.
- 16 Cf. below.
- 17 Sālih, II, 388-9.
- 18 *Maḍsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, 175.
- 19 Khāfi Khān, I, 399-400.
- 20 *Bādshāhnāmā-i-Mulakhas*, Tāhar, 248ff.
- 21 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 258-328.
- 22 ibid., II, 717-52.
- 23 ibid., I, ii, 258-321.
- 24 ibid., II, 717-52.
- 25 Sālih, II, 304; Lāhaurī, II, 279.
- 26 Lāhaurī, II, 132, 310.
- 27 ibid., II, 132.
- 28 ibid., II, 408.
- 29 *Chahār Chaman*, account of the Mughal Emperors.
- 30 *Chahār Chaman*, his autobiography.
- 31 Sālih, I, 393.
- 32 Khāfi Khān, I, 379.
- 33 *Ādāb-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, 55.
- 34 Tabātabāi, 19; Lāhaurī, I, 446.
- 35 Cf. *Kavindanāṭīya's List*.
- 36 ibid.
- 37 Lāhaurī, I, i, 452; Qazvīnī, 405.
- 38 ibid., I, i, 452; Sālih, I, 522; Khāfi Khān, I, 472; Qazvīnī, 357, 455; *Bādshāhnāmā-i-Mulakhas*, 75.
- 39 Lāhaurī, II, 58; Sālih, II, 41.
- 40 Khāfi Khān, I, 472.
- 41 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 121.
- 42 Sālih, I, 518.
- 43 Khāfi Khān, I, 510.
- 43a Sālih, I, 430; Khāfi Khān, I, 510.
- 44 Khāfi Khān, I, 454; Sālih, I, 430; *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 220, 259; *Kalīmāt-i-Tayyībāt*, 7b; *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, i, 280.
- 45 *News Letter*, dated 14-10-1666.
- 46 *Jaipur Records*.
- 47 *Jaipur Records*, letter dated 7 August 1630.
- 48 Shāh Jahān's *farmān* in *J.P.H.S.*, V, 25, 26.
- 49 Qazvīnī, 444-5; Lāhaurī, I, ii, 58; Khāfi Khān, I, 510; Sālih, II, 64. Sādiq Khān says that the offenders were executed, whereas other historians mention either a fine or a punishment.
- 50 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 58; Lāhaurī, I, ii, 57; Qazvīnī, 562.
- 51 Sālih, II, 246-7; Lāhaurī, I, ii, 57; Qazvīnī, 562.
- 52 Qazvīnī, 405.
- 53 *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib*, 186-7.
- 54 ibid., 203.
- 55 ibid., 203.
- 56 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 58.
- 57 See above.

- 58 Sālīh, I, 612.
 59 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 335; Qazvīnī, 401-2, 405.
 60 *Inshā-i-Ibrāhīmī*, letter No. 8.
 61 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 133.
 62 *ibid.*, I, ii, 139; Khāfī Khān, 522-3.
 63 Khāfī Khān, I, 545; Sālīh, I, 240.
 64 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 274.
 65 Khāfī Khān, I, 564; Lāhaurī, II, 109.
 66 Lāhaurī, II, 246.
 67 Khāfī Khān, I, 626.
 68 Qazvīnī, 407.
 69 *Letters* (Ethe 2118), 37.
 70 *Ādāb-i-Ālamgīrī*, 65-68.
 71 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 37.
 72 Qazvīnī, 445.
 73 *Ādāb-i-Ālamgīrī*, 101.
 74 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadi*, I, 220, 227.
 75 Qazvīnī, 445.
 76 *ibid.*, 405.
 77 Manucci, I, 140.
 78 Manrique, II, 105-15.
 79 Cf. *Dara Shukoh* by Qanungo; 'Prince Dara Shukoh' by Dr Yusuf Husain in the *Journal of the Muslim University, Aligarh*, I, 513-62.
 80 *Misra Bandhu Vinod*. Cf. Sālīh, I, 269.
 81 Cf. the list of the Sanskrit writers of Shāh Jahān's reign in *A Bibliography of Mughal India* by Sri Ram Sharma.

Chapter V

AURANGZEB, THE PURITAN

Court Ceremonies

When Aurangzeb became the king of India, Muslim theology triumphed in him. As against Dārā he had taken the attitude of a strict Sunnī determined to oust a latitudinarian in religion.¹ His accession to the throne is marked by the increased Muslim colouring of the court and the court ceremonies.

To begin with, Aurangzeb discontinued the use of the solar Ilāhī year for the purpose of counting his regnal years.² Aurangzeb may have liked to supplant the Ilāhī year for all purposes but the use of a lunar Hijra year was bound to create difficulties in administrative affairs. It was decided, therefore, only to begin every regnal year from the first of Ramazān. That the use of the Ilāhī year continued is clear from the fact that Aurangzeb went on celebrating his solar birthday as well.³ The *‘Ālamgīr Nāma* very often gives Ilāhī dates as well. There are some extant *farmāns* of Aurangzeb bearing both the dates.⁴ It is interesting to note that even the Hindu calendar remained in official use till at least 1671.⁵

In the second year he discontinued the celebration of the solar New Year even though the official historian recognized frankly that it had been hallowed by its traditional celebration by Persian kings.⁶

In his eleventh year, court singers were allowed to be present at court; though music and dancing exhibitions were forbidden. After some time even their presence was dispensed with. Instrumental music was continued in the court at least till the eleventh year.⁷

The same year also saw the discontinuance of the practice of the Jharokā-darshan.⁸ Shāh Jahān had put the practice on a permanent footing by constructing sheds for the public below the salutation balcony. To Aurangzeb it seemed too much like human worship. This, he naturally wanted to discourage. But unfortunately, this deprived his subjects of an opportunity for seeking redress for their grievances when every other avenue of approach to the emperor was denied to them.⁹

(In the twelfth year weighing of the emperor's body against gold, silver and various other commodities was also given up.¹⁰) Even when Aurangzeb lay dying he preferred giving charity without the formality of following this Hindu custom.¹¹ But he continued believing in its efficacy for warding off evil and even recommended this short cut to attaining happiness in this world to one of his grandsons.¹² Most of the princes continued celebrating their birthday by *Tulādān*.¹³

In order to avoid the *Kalima* on the coins being defiled by its handling by the Hindus, its stamping on the coins was abolished.¹⁴ Here Aurangzeb modified the traditions and the practices of earlier Muslim kings probably because he thought that whereas their coins were issued for use among the Muslims, his were used by a population, the predominant majority of which was non-Muslim.

Aurangzeb continued participating in the celebration of the Hindu festival *Dasahra* as long as Maharaja Jaswant Singh and Raja Jai Singh were alive. The official historian described it as the Hindu 'Id. Aurangzeb gave gifts to the Hindu Rajas who were present at the court. Among the recipients of the robes of honour on various occasions on the *Dasahra*, the names of Raja Jai Singh, Kunwar Rām Singh, Maharaja Jaswant Singh and Kunwar Prithvī Singh are mentioned.¹⁵ In January, 1662, we find the

Akhabārāt mentioning the return of a mace-bearer after the distribution of robes for the *Dasahra*.¹⁶

The accession of the Hindu rajas was solemnized by the emperor's making the sacred sign, *tikā* on the forehead of the new raja if he was present at the court. Under Shāh Jahān this duty had been delegated to the Prime Minister. Aurangzeb, however, discontinued the practice altogether in 1679 probably on account of the *tikā* being a Hindu sacred symbol.¹⁷

(In the beginning of the twelfth year, royal astronomers and astrologers were dismissed.¹⁸ It was a part of their duty to convert the lunar into solar years, furnish tables of salaries and help other departments in payment of correct salaries.)The accounts department protested against their dismissal as they were left without expert guidance in the correct reckoning of months and days. Their protests were ignored because, one of the duties of the astronomers was to ascertain auspicious hours for the performance of different works which, on account of their being Hindus, was done according to the Hindu astrology. This may, therefore, be regarded in the nature of his putting an end to a superstitious part of the administration. But we know that Aurangzeb appointed Muslim astrologers for the same purpose.¹⁹ Thus one superstition gave way to another.

The order dismissing the Hindu astrologers does not seem to have been completely enforced at once. When on 5 November 1671 Aurangzeb asked the astrologers to fix an auspicious date for his entry into Delhi, they fixed Maghar Badi 5 (26 November) which was accepted.²⁰ A date described in this fashion could have been fixed by Hindu astrologers alone. In 1702-1703 (1114 A.H.) making of almanacs was also forbidden.²¹

In the twenty-first year scent-burners of gold and silver were removed from the court. Silver inkstands which were conferred on certain clerks as the badge of their office were

discontinued. Silver salvers were used for bringing in money when it was to be given to any one. This was discontinued, shields taking the place of silver salvers. The manufacture and the use of the cloth of gold in the royal workshops were stopped.²²

Moral Regulations

(Besides thus discontinuing Hindu practices at his court Aurangzeb tried, in various other ways as well, to impose a Muslim way of life on his people.) Fortunately a part of it implied eradication of certain social evils as well. Preparation and public sale of wine were prohibited in Shāh Jahān's reign. But Manucci had found its use rather too common among the nobles under Shāh Jahān. Unlike Jahāngir and Shāh Jahān, Aurangzeb was not however content with issuing an ordinance alone. A special department was created—that of the Religious Censor—which was entrusted with the task of enforcing prohibition on the people.²³ When a wine-seller was apprehended, he was only whipped if he was a first offender. On repeating his offence, however, he was imprisoned till he repented of his evil ways.²⁴

But all the activities of the state, backed by vigorous censorship, failed to root out the evil. In 1683 the army of Khān-i-Jahān was reported to be sinning heavily in this respect.²⁵ On 20 April 1693 a Rajput mansabdār was ordered to be transferred as a penalty for drinking.²⁶ A *muftī* gave a *fatwa* that sale of toddy was lawful whereupon a prince-viceroy allowed it to be used. This was reported to the emperor who angrily reprimanded the prince for following a foolish theologian.²⁷ A Parcha-navis (newswriter of a sort) was reported for going drunk to the tomb of a saint and becoming sick there. He was ordered to be brought in chains to the imperial presence.²⁸ On 6 May 1702 Raja Mān Singh Rāthor and many others were degraded for drinking alcohol.²⁹ In February 1703 it was reported

that wine was selling freely in the Bāzār-i-Mansabdārān, whereupon on 28 February the bazaar was abolished and the mansabdārs were ordered to remove their tents to the neighbourhood of the imperial bazaar.³⁰ Again in August 1703 it was reported that wine was being openly sold in the camps of some of the mansabdārs. On 14 August 1703 the censor was ordered to stop it.³¹ On 6 June 1705 the censor reported to the court against the settlement of the Kachhwāhās of Jaipur at Jaisingh Pura near Aurangabad.³²

The provincial governors were ordered to strengthen the hands of the censors in seeing that intoxicants were not openly sold.³³ But it was not found possible to enforce complete prohibition, the disease had already advanced too far to be capable of an easy remedy. But all honour to Aurangzeb for attempting even the impossible. We should however remember that forbidden by the Hindu religion and Islam as it was, this support from the state must have kept many men from drinking wine. Aurangzeb even prohibited the use of such textbooks in the schools, as according to him, encouraged drinking. *Dīwān-i-Hāfiz* was thus proscribed.³⁴

One very important cause of the failure of these regulations was the permission usually granted to the Europeans to distil wine and use it. Many Europeans were appointed as gunners in the imperial artillery. In the reign of Aurangzeb a group of Europeans sent by Khairiyat Khān and Yāqūt Khān was reported to have violated the general imperial commands forbidding alcoholic drinks. It was, however, discovered that no action against them was likely to be effective. This was, then, reported to the emperor who ordered that they be allowed to drink according to their religion and practices.³⁵ They were not however permitted to sell wine. These orders seem to have been circulated to the censors in different parts of the empire.

It was very easy to make a mercenary use of this exceptional permission particularly for the pleasures of those who were accustomed to wine, because the Europeans could make easy money that way. Aurangzeb had assigned quarters outside the city to Europeans in order to guard against their corrupting the morals of the people. Now and then a flagrant case of their selling wine was discovered when the offender would be arrested and imprisoned.³⁶ It is not, however, surprising to find Manucci asserting that there were few who did not drink; even the chief *qāzī*, whom Aurangzeb believed to be innocent, was drinking Manucci's wine secretly.³⁷

(Further Aurangzeb ordered that prostitutes and dancing girls should marry or else leave the empire.³⁸ This order however does not seem to have been much enforced. The difficulties of carrying it out were even greater than those of enforcing prohibition. The great nobles kept very large harems where, if they wanted, they could keep—and did in fact keep—a large number of dancing girls for their own entertainment. The order seems to have been modified as, later on, the censors were ordered to put down prostitution and fornication.³⁹ This again seems to have availed nothing. In the eighth year orders were issued prohibiting the processions of prostitutes.⁴⁰ Ovington who was in Surat in 1679 found many dancing girls and prostitutes there.⁴¹

Aurangzeb continued the practice of his predecessors of prohibiting the burning of unwilling *satis*.⁴² Again it is difficult to say what effect, if any, it made on this time-honoured barbarity. In 1688 he prohibited the castration of young children throughout his empire.⁴³

The cultivation, sale and public use of *bhang* were also prohibited.⁴⁴ An order was issued by the imperial finance minister, Raja Raghu Nāth, to the provincial *diwāns* all over the empire asking them to see that *bhang* was not

cultivated.⁴⁵ It was easy to enforce this, as the cultivation of all crops had to be recorded and reported every season by the revenue officials. But Aurangzeb's government had probably to face the same difficulty which the British Government had to face when it set about limiting cultivation of the poppy to licence-holders. This order could not ordinarily be extended to the States. Manucci tells us that it was very vigorously enforced at first at any rate.⁴⁶ But his description of the measures taken for the purpose seems to refer to wine rather than to *bhang*. Gambling was also prohibited.⁴⁷

Puritanic Restrictions

Aurangzeb further tried to impose the Muslim way of life in certain other more questionable matters. He was not content with forbidding singing, he forbade public musical parties as well.⁴⁸ Even religious music on the day of the Prophet's birth was prohibited. There were some Sūfis, however, who would not give it up. One such was Shaikh Yahyā Chistī, who was a well-known saint of Ahmedabad. When the orders for putting down musical assemblies reached Ahmedabad, the censor, Mirzā Bāqar, tried to enforce it on him as well. He refused however to alter his practices even for a king particularly when, as a prince, Aurangzeb had been one of his devotees. The censor then tried fraud and force, but his plans leaked out and the shaikh and his followers came armed to the assembly. The shaikh now petitioned Aurangzeb but the friend through whom it was sent did not present the petition. At last a letter of complaint found its way to the emperor who admonished the censor and ordered him to leave the shaikh alone.⁴⁹ This seems to have been followed by a general relaxation in favour of the Muslim religious ceremonies. But there was one theologian who was so much upset with the prevalence of musical services on the tombs of the saints that he

demanding their instant abolition holding that such services brought the bones of the saints out of their graves.⁵⁰ Even the suppression of music in general does not seem to have continued long. We find a theologian being put to the trouble of putting down music in the street himself—of course because the censor would take no action.⁵¹ Towards the end of his reign Aurangzeb had to send a special order to put down the practice of the hereditary singers of Kashmir who paraded their profession by welcoming the viceroys and high officials to Kashmir on their assuming office.⁵²

Aurangzeb further tried to rule the fashions of the day by various measures. The allowable length of the beard was fixed at four fingers and orders were given to cut down any extra length wherever found. If we are to believe Manucci's account, an army of men armed with scissors was mobilized which set upon, arrested, and cut offending beards under the command of the censor and his underlings.⁵³ As was but natural the poor suffered most. The nobles were left alone. But such as had to appear in the court dared not rouse imperial wrath by any unseemly conduct.

Garments of cloth of gold were forbidden in the twelfth year.⁵⁴ The length of the trousers to be worn without socks was prescribed in the twenty-first year.⁵⁵ When prince Sultān Muhammad was discovered to be attending a mosque in an unsuitable attire, he was reprimanded.⁵⁶ Rashid Khān, *Dīwān-i-Khālsā*, was found in court with a dagger having a bone handle. When this was pointed out he pleaded he had no other. At once another dagger worth Rs177 was given to him on 7 August 1681.⁵⁷

On Hindu and Muslim festivals, figures of birds, animals, and men and women used to be made of clay for the delight of children. This representation of living beings was considered unlawful and orders were given for its suppression in November 1665.⁵⁸

On Thursday nights, then as now, lamps used to be lighted on the tombs of the saints and other persons respected in their days by the people. Aurangzeb stopped it.⁵⁹

The bohras were divided between the Sunnis and the Shi'as. From time to time the Sunnis had sought the help of the state in order to bring the erring Shi'as to the true faith. Aurangzeb issued an order for the appointment of Sunni amāms and muazzins in their mosques. Most of them seem to have conformed⁶⁰ to the order but the rest kept their faith secret.⁶¹

The khojas received his attention next. Their leader Sayyid Shāhji was ordered to the court. Rather than face the irate emperor, he poisoned himself while on the way. His minor son, who was only twelve, was taken to the court. His followers, however, accused the governor of the province of Gujarat of having poisoned their leader and marched on Ahmedabad, seeking redress against the governor. The fojdār of Bharoch did not allow them to use the boats across the Narbada. They took possession of the boats by force and made themselves masters of the fort of Bharoch. The local fojdār sought help from his neighbours but they did not succeed in expelling the sectarian rebels. The emperor, therefore, ordered the provincial governor to take the fort by assault. Even his efforts were unavailing till he succeeded in surprising the besieged. However the imperialists had to pay dearly for their success. This probably happened in 1689-9 (1101 A.H.).⁶²

Manucci mentions that one Qumir was beheaded by Aurangzeb's orders on account of his writing a work with Christian tendencies which none of his Muslim divines could refute. Another young man is said to have been beheaded for a similar reason.⁶³ A faqir, who claimed to be God, was executed in 1694.⁶⁴

Husain Malik was beheaded for using disrespectful languages towards the Prophet's companions.⁶⁵

(In 1669 Aurangzeb stopped the celebration of the Muharram as well.⁶⁶) This was not an idle threat or a single police measure. The Governor of Ahmedabad was degraded from the command of 3,500 to 3,000 in August 1700 for celebrating the Muharram.⁶⁷ Two more mansabdārs were also degraded about the same time.⁶⁸

(A Portuguese who had at first been converted to Islam and then reverted to his own Christian faith was beheaded as an apostate.⁶⁹) Diwān Muhammed Tāhir was executed for using un-becoming language towards the first three Khalifas.⁷⁰ Mir Hasan came to Kashmir in 1683 (1094 A.H.). During the Muharram he held an assembly and because clouds hid the sun, he was found guilty of breaking the fast before the sun had actually set. He was thereupon expelled from Kashmir.⁷¹ 'Alī Sirhindī used to drink. When remonstrated against, he declared that he was guilty equally with the angels. For this disrespectful language, he was ordered to be beheaded.⁷²

(Aurangzeb's invasion of Bijapur and Golkonda was also partly ascribed to his hatred of the Shi'a kingdoms.) Of course this he had inherited from his father who had made demands upon the Deccanese princes to promulgate Sunnism in their territories. Matters were complicated partly on account of the ascendancy which the Hindus had acquired there in the administration.⁷³

When Sarmad, a famous Sūfi, had reached Delhi from Hyderabad towards the end of Shāh Jahān's reign, Dārā Shikoh had sought his company and paid him many marks of respect. But when Aurangzeb came to the throne, the things took a different turn. Sarmad cried out 'whoever gained the knowledge of His secret became able to annihilate distance. The mullā says that the Prophet ascended to the heavens, Sarmad declares that the heavens came unto the Prophet'.⁷⁴ The mullādom now found its opportunity. Sarmad had not denied the ascension of the Prophet as

Professor Hāshmi seems to imply.⁷⁵ He wrote verses in praise of the Prophet. Aurangzeb sent the chief qāzī to Sarmad to question him about his nudity. Sarmad explained it by declaring that the devil had the upper hand. His answer was so worded as to offend the theologian by a pun on his name. But this in itself was not enough. Sarmad was summoned to the royal court and asked to repeat the whole of the Muslim creed. Sarmad went so far as to declare that there is no God. When asked to repeat the rest he said his realization went no further. So now he was condemned to be executed. When the executioner brought forth his axe for his hateful task, Sarmad welcomed it crying 'I know You in whatever form You care to come' and embraced death like a martyr. His contemporaries associated many miracles with his death and his tomb is still venerated as that of a great saint.⁷⁶

Another scholar who felt the wrath of the emperor was Mullā Shāh Badakhshī. He was a disciple of Miān Mir. He acquired a great reputation as a teacher and mystic. Shāh Jahān and Dārā respected him very much. Shāh Jahān used to exclaim, 'There are two emperors in India, Mullā Shāh and myself'. He was however too independent to give in to worldly considerations. He always contrived to meet Shāh Jahān while standing in order not to have to pay him any honours. When Aurangzeb came to the throne he sent for him on the instigation of some of the courtiers who were opposed to Dārā.⁷⁷ Mullā Shāh was in Kashmir and refused to leave his pleasant abode at the Royal Spring in Srinagar. The emperor, however, wrote to the governor who at last prevailed upon him to answer the royal summons. From Lahore he sent a chronogram of the emperor's accession. The emperor was very much pleased at this and allowed him to live at Lahore. The verses however bore two meanings, one of them being not very complimentary to Aurangzeb. He died in Lahore in 1672 and was buried

near the grave of his guide, Miān Mir. Mullā Shāh was a great writer and wrote a commentary on the Qur'ān as well.⁷⁸

Sayyid Ni'mat Allah was also summoned from Bengal. He had been on good relations with Shāh Shujā'. He refused to obey the royal command. Fearing worse, his son placed him in a boat which was about to leave when another order came cancelling the previous summons.⁷⁹

Shaikh Muhib-Allah of Allahabad also incurred royal displeasure for one of his works. Fortunately he had passed beyond the royal reach. His disciples were called upon to explain their teacher's heretic opinions. One of them thought it best to disavow his master. Another, Shaikh Muhammad, acknowledged that he was a disciple of his master but he regretted that he had not attained to the position of his master and could not, therefore, either fully expound his master's work or prove it orthodox.⁸⁰

The emperor's orthodoxy could not tolerate even a good poet. Shādmān wrote some verses which pleased the emperor. But in order to save the soul of the poet, he made him renounce the muse.⁸¹

So great was the emperor's hatred of this 'useless calling' that Qāzī 'Abdul 'Azīz very nearly secured the dismissal of another theologian by suggesting that the seal of his office was a foot of a verse. The accused had to convince the emperor that he had nothing whatever to do with such an objectionable art as poetry.⁸²

Hindus in the Public Services

{Akbar had opened the ranks of the Mughal administration to the Hindus and Muslims alike, with the result that out of 137 living mansabdārs of 1,000 and above, fourteen were Hindus at the time the *Ain* was completed.} Under Jahāngīr, out of forty-seven mansabdārs of 3,000 and above six were Hindus. In Shāh Jahān's reign the number of mansabdārs was very much increased. At the end of the

31st year, there were 241 mansabdārs of 1,000 and above, out of which fifty-one were Hindus. When the War of Succession broke out, Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur was the premier noble of the empire holding the status of a *Haft Hazārī* and 7,000 horse out of which 5,000 were *Do Aspa* and *Sih Aspa* (having two or three horses). He, thus, held the highest office which was open to an imperial subject. In the revenue department Rāi-i-Rāyān Raghu Nāth was the imperial revenue minister at this time.

Thus when Aurangzeb disputed the right of Shāh Jahān to allow Dārā to deputize for him, the Hindus occupied a very important position in the public services of the empire.

In the subordinate ranks they monopolized the revenue and accounts department. The Muslims had no turn for such routine work and preferred to enter the state service by joining the army. Besides this the personal assistants of most of the executive heads were also Hindus.

Such was the position when Aurangzeb claimed the empire. Unfortunately for us we have no detailed official history of Aurangzeb's reign. Muhammad Kāzīm was allowed to write the history of Aurangzeb's reign for the first ten years only. The *Māāsir-i-ʿAlamgīrī* and the *Muntakhib-ul-Lubāb* do not give us that detailed account of the reign, the standard for which was set by Kāzīm. Of course there are the voluminous *Jaipur Records* and the *News Letters* of Aurangzeb's reign. But these leave many tantalizing gaps. The result is that it is rather difficult to assess the position of the Hindus in the public services of his reign.

An analysis of the list of mansabdārs above the rank of *Yak Hazārī* (one thousand) compiled from the contemporary (*Akhabārāt*, *Jaipur Records*, *ʿAlamgīr Nāma*, *Māāsir-i-ʿAlamgīrī* and the *Muntakhib-ul-Lubāb* and published as an appendix to this chapter, yields a few interesting results. We have to keep in view the fact that it includes all appointments made during the reign. } Thus the large number of the

Hindu mansabdārs—148—does not necessarily indicate any liberal policy of Aurangzeb. It is largely to be credited to his long reign. Thus we have four Rajas of Jaipur, Jai Singh I, Rām Singh, Bishan Singh and Jai Singh II included in the list. Similarly Udaipur is represented by three Rajas, Rāj Singh, Jai Singh and Amar Singh. Bikaner saw Rāo Karn, Raja Anūp Singh the minor, Sarūp Singh, Anurodh Singh and Budh Singh in succession, the last outliving Aurangzeb. In Kota, Jagat Singh, Kishan Singh and Rām Singh succeeded one another during the fifty years of the Mughal emperor's long reign. We cannot therefore profitably compare this list of 148 mansabdārs with the 51 Hindu mansabdārs, all of whom were living at the end of the 30th year of Shāh Jahān's reign.

We definitely know that out of the first thirty-one of these mansabdārs, not more than ten survived Aurangzeb. Out of the next sixteen commanders of 3,000, eight were dead, one was a rebel, one had ceased to figure in the annals, and was probably dead, six alone are definitely known to be living. Thus at this time out of the forty-seven grantees in the list only sixteen are known to be living. It is thus safe to conclude that the total number of the living Hindu mansabdārs was fifty at the time of Aurangzeb's death against fifty-one towards the end of Shāh Jahān's reign. We definitely know that only some thirty of these mansabdārs were living at the time.

(Thus towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign there was a smaller number of Hindus occupying the mansabs of 1,000, and above, than the number of similar mansabdārs towards the end of Shāh Jahān's reign.) But the decrease in number becomes still more significant when we take into account the increase in the total number of the mansabdārs which rose enormously in the reign of Aurangzeb. Figures are available for the year 1657 when under Shāh Jahān there were 8,000 mansabdārs in all,⁸³ whereas in 1690, the number

of mansabdārs had risen to 14,556.⁸⁴ During the later seventeen years of Aurangzeb's reign the number must have increased still further.

This doubling of the number of mansabdārs of all classes does not show a proportional increase in the number of the Hindus who held mansabs of 1,000 and above. Thus it is safe to assert that the number of the Hindus holding such ranks towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign had gone down. The percentage of the Hindus in the higher ranks of the state could not have been more than 50 per cent of what it was towards the end of Shāh Jahān's reign.

This list is suggestive in another way as well. When Aurangzeb became the emperor, we find that the two premier nobles of the empire were Hindus, and the finance minister also was a Hindu. Maharaja Jaswant Singh served as the governor of Gujarat, as the leader of the first Mughal expedition against the Marathas, and then as an assistant of a royal prince in the government of Kabul. He was deputed wherever hard work was expected. Raja Jai Singh when he was sent against Shivājī to the Deccan, controlled the ordinary civil and military authorities in the Deccan and became the highest ruling authority besides being a leader of the Mughal expedition.⁸⁵ After exhausting all imperial favours as far as official salary and status were concerned, the emperor added to his salary a princely allowance of Rs25,000 a year.⁸⁶ But towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign we do not find a single Hindu provincial governor. In fact no Hindu was appointed a provincial governor after the death of these two Rajput commanders; no Hindu succeeded Raja Raghū Nāth as the finance minister either. *Ahkām-i-Alamgīrī* contains an order which Aurangzeb issued forbidding the employment of Rajputs either as fojdārs or provincial governors.⁸⁷ This seems to have been acted upon. When the prince commander of an expedition recommended an increment in the status of Indar Singh and

Bahādur Singh, Aurangzeb sharply reprimanded the prince and turned down the recommendation.⁸⁸ Another prince recommended Jai Singh II, for deputy governorship but Aurangzeb told him that it was not proper for him to make such a recommendation.⁸⁹ Deliberately thus Aurangzeb shut out the Hindus from the highest offices, though not from the highest ranks of the imperial services. As will be clear from the list in the appendix there were Hindu commanders of the highest ranks. But of them Sāhu was a minor whom Aurangzeb was trying to convert to Islam.⁹⁰ He drew a salary without filling any office. Among the thirteen commanders of 5,000, nine were Marāthās who were really raised to their high status on their submission, most of them had been directly appointed to their high commands. Among the remaining five, two were reigning Ranas of Udaipur, one of Jaipur and the rest also held hereditary lands. Thus under Aurangzeb, though some Hindus enjoyed the salary and the profits of even the highest posts (mansabs), they were not called upon, in the latter half of his reign, to fill any high executive or administrative offices. Their position was thus lowered.

The study of the fortunes of certain houses who held hereditary office as ruling princes also yields similar results. Rānā Rāj Singh was a commander of 6,000, not so his successors who received a command of 5,000.⁹¹ Raja Jai Singh of Jaipur was a commander of 7,000.⁹² The fortunes of his house show an increasingly declining tendency. His successor Rām Singh rose to be a commander of 5,000.⁹³ Raja Bishan Singh died as a commander of 4,000.⁹⁴ Raja Jai Singh, II, had the lowest command ever held by a Kachhwāhā prince, that of 2,000. In Jodhpur, after Maharaja Jaswant Singh came a deluge. Raja Indar Singh, a nephew of his, was no doubt at first appointed to the command of 3,500 as his successor. But the Rajput War followed and Jodhpur was 'annexed' though the Rajputs

did everything to make the occupation as difficult and as costly as possible. Raja Rājārūp of Nurpur (in the Punjab) was a commander of 3,500.⁹⁵ His son and successor Māndhātā is only mentioned as holding the rank of a commander of 1,000.⁹⁶ Raja Bhīm Singh, the founder of the house of Banera (in Udaipur, Rajputana), was a commander of 5,000,⁹⁷ but his son and successor Sūraj Mall rose to the command of 1,000 only.⁹⁸ Thus the fortune of many distinguished houses as well declined under Aurangzeb. We have to remember that we have been dealing here with houses which held hereditary lands. The contractions of their status cannot be explained therefore simply by the fact that the mansabs depended on the personal merits of the incumbents.

Thus Aurangzeb seemed to have followed a threefold policy with reference to the high Hindu mansabdārs. There was a general reduction in the number of Hindus holding High mansabs. Hindus were not called upon to hold high executive office, or discharge responsible military duties. Usually the heads of various hereditary houses were not given the same status as had been held by their predecessors.

The petty officials could expect to fare no better. Various orders were passed to break the monopoly of the Hindus in the routine jobs in the revenue department and in the clerical establishment. There is a general order in the *Kalimāt-i-Tayyibāt* forbidding the employment of the Hindus.⁹⁹ Then there is the order preserved in the *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*¹⁰⁰ and *Muntakhib-ul-Lubāb*¹⁰¹ forbidding the employment of the Hindus in the revenue department and as personal assistants to various executive heads. An attempt was made to enforce these orders. Now the Hindu monopoly of these jobs was due to the fact that the Muslims preferred military careers. Though Aurangzeb reprimanded even a prince for daring to suggest the name

of a Hindu for such an appointment, he could not succeed in diverting the energies of the Muslims to these petty offices.¹⁰² The attempt failed. Some Hindu Karoris of crownlands gave place to Muslims,¹⁰³ others in the revenue department changed their religion to retain their places.¹⁰⁴ Aurangzeb then ordered that one of the two personal assistants to various officers should be a Muslim.¹⁰⁵ He valiantly tried to replace Hindu public servants by Muslims wherever he could. Twenty Hindu musketeers of the royal guards were dismissed to give place to Muslims on 27 July 1703.¹⁰⁶ In his sixteenth year he had resumed all the grants made to Hindus.¹⁰⁷

No wonder these things created a feeling of superiority among the Muslims. One Sayyid Amir came to Gujarat in the forty-sixth year of Aurangzeb's reign. He was appointed to fill a post. The Governor discovered that he would have to serve under a Hindu, no other than Durgā Dās Rāthor. He declined to allow him to assume office thinking it derogatory for a Muslim to serve under a Hindu. A Hindu thereupon was appointed to the office in question.¹⁰⁸

Aurangzeb contributed to the widening of this gulf between the Hindus and the Muslims further, by ordering on 19 November 1702 that no Hindu in the army was to employ Muslim servants.¹⁰⁹

The turning point in this as in many other things in this reign seems to have been the death of Maharaja Jaswant Singh. Raja Raghu Nāth Dās, Raja Jai Singh, and Maharaja Jaswant Singh had been three checks on Aurangzeb's religious enthusiasm. One after another they died, and with the death of the last he felt emancipated. The Rajput war, born of his intention to swallow Jodhpur, further estranged the Hindus, particularly the Rajputs. It is not right to say that after the Rajput war no Rajput served under Aurangzeb. Except those bent on carving out new independent hereditary principalities, few Rajputs,

however, could be found to serve enthusiastically under him. As long as Bijapur and Golkonda lay unconquered, there was some work for Rajput blades to do. But after their conquest the Marāthā warfare had little to attract Rajput valour. When forts were surrendered by bribing the commanders systematically,¹¹⁰ the Rajputs were no longer in demand. Besides, as we have already seen Aurangzeb's puritanic nature put various vexatious obstacles in the path of the Rajputs.

Thus Aurangzeb deliberately worsened the position of the Hindus in the public services. Higher offices were closed to them; the Muslims were openly preferred. Dismissal of the Hindus from the revenue department was attempted though it was of no avail.

Destruction of Hindu Temples

Early in the reign of Shāh Jahān, it was brought to his notice that the building of new temples and the repairing of old ones, though in conformity with the liberal practices of the reign of Akbar and Jahāngīr, were, in reality, against the Muslim law and usage. As we have already seen, Shāh Jahān for some time tried to enforce the Muslim law, as thus interpreted, but later in his reign it fell into disuse and several temples were repaired and added to. Shortly after coming to the throne, Aurangzeb issued the following order on 28 February 1659, probably in connexion with a dispute as to the right of 'holding charge of' the ancient temples of Benares.

('It has been decided according to our Canon law that long standing temples should not be demolished but no new temples be allowed to be built') Our royal command is that you should direct that in future no person shall, in *unlawful ways*, interfere with or disturb the Brahmans and other Hindu residents in those places.'¹¹¹

This, however, did not cover military operations. In 1661 Aurangzeb in his zeal to uphold, what he considered to be the law of Islam, sent orders to his Viceroy of Bihar, Daud Khān, to conquer Palamau. In the military operations that followed, many temples were destroyed¹¹² signaling the victories of the Mughal arms. Towards the end of the same year when Mir Jumla made war on the Raja of Kuch Bihar, the Mughals destroyed many temples during the course of their operations. Idols were broken, and some of the temples were converted into mosques.¹¹³

But these were military measures. Such destruction had taken place even in the reign of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān in the wake of military operations. Soon, however, Aurangzeb began to act even without the provocation of military policy. The temple of Somnath was destroyed early in his reign.¹¹⁴ This seems to have been one of the results of the order sent to his officials in Gujarat dated 20 November 1665.¹¹⁵ This order put an end to Shāh Jahān's supersession of Aurangzeb's order, who as the prince viceroy of Gujarat, had destroyed many temples. Aurangzeb gave directions for the destruction of such temples in Gujarat as had at one time been destroyed or desecrated by him as the prince viceroy of Gujarat but had later on been resumed by the Hindus. It is difficult to understand why these temples in Gujarat were singled out for attack. Aurangzeb probably felt that he was thus initiating no new policy, but simply carrying out Shāh Jahān's original policy which had been later reversed.

This seems to have been followed about this time by an order to the governor of Orissa. It bears no date, but as it refers to new temples only and orders the destruction of temples built during the last ten or twelve years, it might have been issued in 1669 and presumably within twelve years (lunar) of Aurangzeb's reign. The provincial governor thereupon issued the following order to his officials:—

‘To all fojdlārs, garrison commanders, accountants, district collectors of land revenue and their officials from Katak to Midnapur in the frontiers of Orissa.

The imperial bakhshī Asad Khān has sent a letter written according to the instructions of the emperor to say that the emperor, learning from the *News Letter* of the province of Orissa that at the village of Tilkkuti in Mednipur a temple has been built, has issued his august mandate for its destruction and the destruction of all temples built anywhere in the province. Therefore, you are hereby commanded with extreme urgency that immediately on the receipt of this letter you should destroy the above-mentioned temples. Every temple built during the last ten or twelve years should be demolished without delay. Also do not allow the Hindus and infidels to repair their old temples. Reports of the destruction of temples should be sent to the court under the seal of qāzīs and attested by pious shaikhs.’ 116

This order was obviously provoked by the building of a new temple in a village in Orissa. It is apparent even from a perusal of the Benares *sanad* already quoted, that early in Aurangzeb’s reign it seems to have been ordered that no new temples were to be built nor old ones repaired. Similar orders had been issued by Shāh Jahān as well in his sixth year. Thus this order did not promulgate any new law, it simply declared and revived an old interpretation of the Muslim law which had become obsolete. It was presumably on that account that the *News Letters* had mentioned the building of a new temple in an insignificant village of Orissa. As the law seems to have been defied and its defiance gone unnoticed and unpunished, the new order left nothing to the discretion of the civil or military servants of the empire—some of them were Hindus who might have ignored the order. The governor addressed his instructions to the military officers serving as commanders of garrisons, execu-

tive heads of the Sarkārs serving as fojdārs, heads of the revenue department in the sarkār, agents of the fojdārs, and accountants. Now this roped in almost all Mughal officers, civil and military. As usually there was not much love lost between the representatives of different departments in the same locality, the governor ensured that none of them should be remiss in performing his duty in this connexion by the fear of being complained against by others. However, there was still the fear that in any one locality all might conspire to leave this work undone. Even this was provided against. Their own accounts were not to be trusted. They had to get them attested by the qāzīs and pious shaikhs.

About the same time Aurangzeb's attention was turned towards Muttra. Here many beautiful temples had been raised by the piety of the Hindu rajas and rich men, particularly during the reign of Akbar and Jahāngir. Aurangzeb picked out for attack what looked like a work of repairs in the famous temple of Keshav Rāi. Its railing that had once been made of wood had long before become too weak to serve any useful purpose. Under Shāh Jahān, Dārā Shukoh had built at his own cost a railing of stone. Being a work of repairs as well as a new structure, it became an emblem of a Muslim's fall from grace. On 14 October 1666 its removal by the fojdār of Muttra was reported to the imperial court.¹¹⁷ Some time after the death of Jai Singh, Aurangzeb is alleged to have demolished the Lalta temple near Delhi.¹¹⁸

It was three years later that a general order was issued for the destruction of all the schools and temples of the Hindus. On 9 April 1669 it was reported to the emperor, that the Brahmans of Sind, Multan and particularly of Benares were using their temples as schools, which attracted students, Hindus and Muslims alike, from great distances. Jahāngir had not been able to tolerate even a young Muslim

going to a yogi for instruction in religious matters. It was but natural, therefore, that Aurangzeb should have been upset by such a report. But whereas Jahāngīr had held the two Muslims concerned guilty and punished them, Aurangzeb gave an order for the punishment of those whose only offence was the imparting of religious education to those who came to them.

‘Orders in accordance with the organisation of Islam were sent to the Governors of all the provinces that they should destroy the schools and temples of the infidels and put an end to their educational activities as well as the practices of the religion of the Kafirs.’¹¹⁰ De Graaf who was at Hooghly in 1670, heard about these orders and reported:

‘In the month of January, all the governors and native officers received an order from the Great Mughal prohibiting the practice of Pagan religion throughout the country and closing down all the temples and sanctuaries of Idol worshippers . . . in the hope that some pagans would embrace the Muslim religion.’¹²⁰

It is rather difficult to understand the reasoning of the quasi-official historian or to follow Aurangzeb’s line of thought. Complaints came only from certain parts of the country, not from all over the empire. If any party was guilty of the violation of any Muslim injunction, or secular Mughal law, at worst they were the teachers concerned in those ‘reprehensible practices’. The temples had rather been sinned against than sinning. For the fault of certain Brahmans, to destroy all the places of religious worship of the Hindus was in itself criminal. It is more reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the reason officially advanced in the chronicle was only an occasion, if not the excuse, for Aurangzeb’s embarking on a militant policy of religious persecution. He must have already made up his mind to launch forth a general attack on Hindu places of worship. It formed a part of his plan of governing India according to

what he understood to be the strict letter of the Muslim law.

This general order formed a parting of the ways between the old and the new Mughal religious policy. It made Akbar's plan of a secular state in India a dream. It went back not only on the tolerant practices of Akbar, but the earlier Muslim ways of government in India as well. It made the Muslim rulers of India once again the conquerors and wielders of the sword of Islam rather than her rulers. Now and then a Feroz Shāh or a Sikandar Lodhī had tried to embark on such a policy earlier but even they had not thought it politic to embark on such an unpopular programme. Aurangzeb in launching forth this attack on Hinduism did go against the practices of most of the earlier Muslim rulers in India and elsewhere.

Soon after the order was issued, news of the destruction of temples from all parts of the country began to arrive. A royal messenger was sent to demolish the temple of Malarina (now in Jaipur but probably then included in the imperial district of Ajmer) in May 1669.¹²¹ In August 1669 the temple of Viśvanāth at Benares was demolished.¹²² The presiding priest of the temple was just in time to remove the idols from the temple and to throw them into a neighbouring well which thus became a centre of pious interest ever after. The temple of Gopī Nāth in Benares was also destroyed about the same time.

Then came the turn of the temple of Keshav Rāi at Muttra built at a cost of Rs33,00,000 by Rāo Bīr Singh Bundelā in the reign of Jahāngīr.¹²³ It had excited the envy of many Muslims, before Aurangzeb, who however had not Aurangzeb's opportunities and power.¹²⁴ It had been built after the style of the famous temple at Bindraban which Mān Singh had built at a cost of Rs5,00,000. But Bīr Singh had improved upon his model and spent more than six times as much as Mān Singh had lavished on his shrine

at Bindrabau.¹²⁵ It had become a centre of pilgrimage for the whole of India. The idols, studded with precious stones and adorned with gold works, were all taken to Agra and there buried under the steps of Jahānārā's mosque. The temple was levelled to the ground and a mosque was ordered to be built on the site to mark the acquisition of religious merit by the emperor.¹²⁶

No wonder that this struck consternation in the Hindu mind. The priests of the temple of Govardhan founded by the Balabhācāryā sought safety in flight. The idols were removed and the priests softly stole out in the night. Imperial territories offered no place of safe asylum either to the god or his votaries. After an adventurous journey, they at last reached Jodhpur. Maharaja Jaswant Singh was away on imperial errands. His subordinates in the state did not feel strong enough to house the god who might have soon excited the wrath of the Mughal emperor. Dāmodar Lāl, the head of the priesthood in charge of the temple, sent Gopināth to Maharaja Rāj Singh to beg for a place to be able to serve his religion in peace. The Sasodia prince extended his welcome to Dāmodar Lāl. The party left Champāsani on 5 December 1671, and was right royally received by Maharaja Rāj Singh on the frontiers of his state. It was decided to house the god in Sihar and with due religious ceremony, the god was installed on 10 March 1672.¹²⁷

Mewar thus became the centre of Vaiṣṇavism in India. The tiny village of Sihar has now grown into an important town which, named after the god, is known as Nathdwara.

At Kankroli (in Udaipur State) another Vaiṣṇava idol of Kṛṣṇa similarly brought down from Bindrabau had been housed a little earlier. It forms another, though less famous, shrine of Vaiṣṇavism in India today. Thus, thanks to Aurangzeb's religious zeal, Udaipur State became a new Bindrabau to the devotees of the Bhakti cult.

In Gujarat, the Hindus of Surat discovered an ingenious method of saving some of their temples. They agreed to make certain payments for them. This, however, led to greater demands from the qāzīs and the censors till at last the banias began to groan under their extortion.¹²⁸

These measures were bound to create opposition in some quarters at least. In March 1671 it was reported that a Muslim officer who had been sent to demolish the Hindu temples in and around Ujjain was killed with many of his followers on account of the riot that had followed his attempts at destroying the temples there. He had succeeded in destroying some of the temples, but in one place, a Rajput chief had opposed this wanton destruction of his religious places. He had overpowered the Mughal forces and destroyed its leader and many of his men.¹²⁹ In Gujarat somewhere near Ahmedabad, kolis seem to have taken possession of a mosque and prevented Friday prayers there. Imperial orders were thereupon issued to the provincial officers in Gujarat to secure the use of the mosque for Friday prayers.¹³⁰

We have already noticed that De Graaf heard of the general order issued by Aurangzeb for the destruction of Hindu places of worship in January 1670. In far off Bengal, it took some time to actively pursue the policy laid down by the emperor. But at last in the first half of the year 1672, Government agents were sent to all parganas with orders to carry out the emperor's instructions and destroy all the Hindu temples.¹³¹

The records of the reign thereafter are silent for some years. This may be either due to a slackening of the imperial zeal in the matter or the incidents became too ordinary an affair to be recorded by the Muslim chroniclers.

This lull was broken in 1679, when Aurangzeb's fury broke out with a vengeance. Maharaja Jaswant Singh died on 10 December 1678. When Aurangzeb heard of it towards the end of the month, he waited patiently for some time and

then on 9 March 1679 orders were given for the sequestration of the state to the crown. About this time Dorāb Khān had been sent to Khandela where he demolished various temples in the neighbourhood on 8 March 1679.¹³² This was followed by the despatch of Khān-i-Jahān to Jodhpur. He destroyed many temples there early in 1679 and as an evidence of his 'meritorious conduct' he brought cartloads of idols from those temples to Delhi. These were placed in public places in the court and the Friday Mosque.¹³³ Aurangzeb was not yet at war with Jodhpur which had really been converted into a crownland property. The destruction of its temples therefore was not an act of warfare. It was an announcement that the State was no longer being governed by a Hindu raja but had now passed into imperial hands.

(Aurangzeb's dealings with the Rāthors of Jodhpur resulted in the Rajput War.) Udaipur offered unique opportunities for harassing the Mughals. The Maharana fled to his mountains leaving Udaipur to pass into the hands of the Mughals. The royal temple in front of the palace was destroyed. When Aurangzeb visited Udai Sāgar on 24 January 1680, he ordered that the three temples that were standing on the edge of the lake be demolished. On 29 January it was reported that the number of temples destroyed in and around Udaipur (of course including the four already mentioned) was 172. Aurangzeb's visit to Chitor on 22 February 1680 was followed by the destruction of 63 temples.¹³⁴ Thus in the state of Udaipur alone 235 temples were reported to have been destroyed. These probably did not include the temple at Someśvara in western Mewar.¹³⁵

Udaipur was at war with Delhi, the destruction of its temples may have formed a part of the ruthless military campaign undertaken with a view to compelling the Rajputs to sue for peace. But it produced, a lamentable effect. Bhīm, a younger son of the Rana, retaliated by attacking

Ahmednagar and demolishing many mosques big and small, there.¹³⁶

But Aurangzeb did not confine his iconoclastic activities to the warring States alone. (Orders were given to demolish Hindu temples in the friendly State of Jaipur as well.) An imperial agent, Abū Tarāb, was sent for this purpose and he set about his task with a thoroughness that soon produced a panic. Most of the temples he was able to destroy easily,¹³⁷ but there was some opposition in one temple. Certain Rajputs assumed positions there wherefrom they could easily deal with the masons who were sent to demolish the temple. The imperial agents had soon to beat a retreat. The officer in charge of the party thereupon complained to the rajās's officials. A fojdār was asked to accompany the imperial agent to insure that the imperial officials were not molested in their task of pulling down the temple. There was a skirmish between the soldiers accompanying the fojdār and the Rajputs in the temple. Not before all the Rajputs had been killed, was it possible for the imperial agent to destroy the temple.¹³⁸ Abū Tarāb reached the court on 10 August 1680, and reported that he had demolished as many as sixty-six temples in Amber.¹³⁹ A letter from one Bhagwān Dās to Raja Rām Singh written probably about this time tells us of the destruction of Karor (?) temple in Amber by Dalair, an imperial messenger.¹⁴⁰

When the war with the Rajputs was over, Aurangzeb decided to leave Ajmer for the Deccan. His march seems to have been marked with the destruction of many temples on the way. On 21 May 1681 the superintendent of the labourers was ordered to destroy all the temples on the route.¹⁴¹ Some time after, one Manawar Beg, a mason, with thirty artisans was sent to raze the temples of the Rajputs.¹⁴² On 27 September 1681 the emperor issued orders for the destruction of the temples at Lakheri.¹⁴³ On 13 October 1681, when he left Jaipur, Qumar-ud-Din

suggested that though all the temples in the neighbourhood had been closed, they should be destroyed. Aurangzeb however was content with closing them down and ordered that they be allowed to stand as there were no Muslims living in that area.¹⁴⁴

When Aurangzeb made war upon Bijapur and Golkanda he met with stout opposition from some of his divines. Shaikh-ul-Islām, his *sadr-us-sadūr*, was dismissed for opposing it. His successor 'Abdullah remonstrated against the destruction of the Muslims in the affair. He was forbidden royal presence.¹⁴⁵

Naturally when Golkanda was conquered, the emperor justified its conquest by ordering the destruction of the temples in Hyderabad and their conversion into mosques in 1687.¹⁴⁶ The fall and capture of Bijapur was similarly solemnized though here the destruction of temples seems to have been delayed for several years, probably till 1698.¹⁴⁷

Elsewhere the same policy was being followed. About this time, on 14 April 1692, orders were issued to the provincial governor and the district *fojdār* to demolish the temples at Rasulpur.¹⁴⁸ In 1693, the Haitheswar temple at Barv Nagar in Gujarat was demolished.¹⁴⁹

A Jaipur letter, dated 14 February 1690, reported that in Kanwar in Jaipur where the temples had perhaps already been demolished, a religious fair was held and idols were publicly worshipped. This happened three times in the course of a year. The censor complained to the emperor so that suitable action might be taken against those responsible for it.¹⁵⁰

Ghulām Muhammed, a news-writer, accompanying the expedition against the Jāts reported, on 28 May 1690, to the emperor that Mohan Singh, one of the Rajput chiefs accompanying Bishan Singh, had set up a temple in the house of Sardul Singh.¹⁵¹ In December 1690, a complaint was made to the emperor that the temples in Marwar that had

once been converted into places of residence by the Muslim jagūdār, had again been opened for public worship.¹⁵²

Sankar, a messenger, was sent to demolish a temple near Sheogaon. He came back after pulling it down on 20 November 1693.¹⁵³

In April 1694 it was reported to the emperor that the imperial censor had tried to prevent public idol worship in Jaisinghpura near Aurangabad. The Vairāgi priests of the temple were arrested but were soon rescued by the Rajputs.¹⁵⁴

Bijai Singh and several other Hindus were reported to be carrying on public worship of idols in a temple in the neighbourhood of Ajmer. On 23 June 1694 the governor of Ajmer was ordered to destroy the temple and stop the public celebration of idol worship there.¹⁵⁵ In 1696-97 (1108 A.H.) orders were issued for the destruction of the major temples at Sorath in Gujarat.¹⁵⁶

Muhammad Shāh, a censor attached to the army, reported that many soldiers went to worship idols in the temple at Purandhar. On 2 January 1705 orders were given that the temple be desecrated and demolished.¹⁵⁷ The temple of Wakenkhera in the fort was demolished on 2 March 1705.¹⁵⁸

Besides these cases where dates are available there are others where the dates are not definitely known.

The Juma' Masjid at Irach (in Bundelkhand) is assigned to Aurangzeb's reign. It is said to be built of materials taken from a Hindu temple.¹⁵⁹ While passing through Udaipur in Bundelkhand (about 1681) Aurangzeb is said to have ordered the Śaiva temple there to be demolished. The orders were however modified, and the temple was converted into a mosque.¹⁶⁰ The temples at Gayaspur near Bhilsa¹⁶¹ and the temple of Khaundai Rāo in Gujarat were also destroyed.¹⁶²

In a small village in the sarkār of Sirhind, a Sikh temple was demolished and converted into a mosque. An imām

was appointed who was subsequently killed.¹⁶³ Several other Sikh temples were also destroyed.¹⁶⁴

In Orissa some time before 1670 the temple at Kedarpur was demolished and converted into a mosque.¹⁶⁵

The private house of a Rajput, Devi Singh, in the pargana of Alup, which was used as a temple, was converted into a mosque.¹⁶⁶

Aurangzeb urged the appointment of an officer on special duty in order to destroy the Hindu temples in Maharashtra. He discovered that it was not possible for the labourers accompanying the royal army on the march to destroy all the temples during the short time at their disposal with the limited number of men available to them.¹⁶⁷

He stopped the public worship at the Hindu temple of Dwarka.¹⁶⁸

When Aurangzeb conquered the Karnatic he allowed the famous temple at Tirupati to stand, partly on account of the large revenue he is alleged to have derived from the pilgrimages of the Hindus to the temple and partly for fear that its destruction might cause a rebellion difficult to suppress.¹⁶⁹

Aurangzeb destroyed the temples at Mayapur (Hardwar) and Ayodhya.¹⁷⁰ 'All of them are thronged with worshippers, even those that are destroyed are still venerated by the Hindus and visited by the offering of alms.'¹⁷¹

(But India is a big country. Not even Aurangzeb's zeal was equal to the task of destroying all the temples in the country.) From time to time he had to issue orders modifying the general orders passed in 1669. Thus we find that though he gave orders for the destruction of all the Hindu public temples, yet he was content with closing down those that were built in an entirely Hindu population. If the English Factors are to be believed, his officers allowed the Hindus to take back their temples from them on payment of large sums of money. In the South where he spent the

last twenty seven years of his reign, Aurangzeb was usually content with leaving many Hindu temples standing as he was afraid of rousing the feelings of his Hindu subjects in the Deccan where the suppression of rebellions was not an easy matter. But the discontent occasioned by his orders could not be thus brought to an end.

Some Hindu temples built in the reign of Aurangzeb are known to exist in the town of Bishalpur (in Bengal). These temples date back to his reign according to the inscriptions to be found on them. Two were built in 1681 and one was built in 1690.¹⁷²

Aurangzeb allowed the Salasraing tank in Gujarat to be kept filled with water at the expense of the state.¹⁷³

Punitive Regulations against the Hindus

Besides the measures Aurangzeb took for the purpose of reducing the number of the Hindus in the public services, many other restrictions were imposed on them. The pilgrimage tax was re-imposed.¹⁷⁴ Bernier tells us that at the time of an eclipse of the Sun three lakhs of rupees were paid to the state.¹⁷⁵ The celebration of some religious festivals was stopped. The Holi ceased to be celebrated by imperial orders issued on 20 November 1665.¹⁷⁶ It was not a police order alone, promulgated for the purpose of keeping peace and order during the Holi days as Sir Jadunath Sarkar has suggested.¹⁷⁷ Raja Bhīm of Banera and Kishen Singh while serving in South India in 1692, made arrangements for the celebration of the Holi. The censor tried to stop the celebration, but as Bhim and Kishen Singh were officers of high status, the censor's attempts were of no use. He reported the matter to the emperor by whose order the celebrations were stopped.¹⁷⁸ In 1704, 200 soldiers were placed at the disposal of the censor for the purpose of preventing the celebration of the Holi.¹⁷⁹ Of course the emperor was not always able to stop the celebrations. In

1693 there was a riot in Agra during the celebrations and many persons were wounded.¹⁸⁰ The celebration of Dīpāvalī also was prohibited in 1665.¹⁸¹ In 1703 Hindus were not allowed to burn their dead on the banks of the river Sabarmati in Ahmedabad.¹⁸² An earlier order issued in 1696 had imposed similar restrictions with regard to the Jamuna in Delhi.¹⁸³

An order was issued to the jagirdār of Mustafabad to close the hot water-springs there to the public. The Hindus performed worship there whereas Muslim paralytics came for a cure. The paraphernalia of worship was also confiscated.¹⁸⁴

{Fireworks of all kinds were prohibited.¹⁸⁵ It was laid down in the *Fatāwa-i-‘Ālamgīrī* that the Hindus should not be allowed to look like Muslims. \ In furtherance of this it was ordered in 1694 that, except Rajputs and Marathas, no Hindus were to be allowed to ride an ‘Īrāqī or Tūrānī horse, an elephant, nor to use a palanquin.¹⁸⁶ A Hindu disobeying this order in 1694 in Multan had his horse and saddle confiscated.¹⁸⁷ The deshmuḥ of Ahmadnagar was discovered in 1703 riding in a palanquin and at once the imperial orders were enforced against him.¹⁸⁸ It seems, thus, that the exception in favour of the Marathas was not always respected. In 1702 orders were given that the Muslim engravers be not allowed to engrave the names of Hindu gods and goddesses on the seals of the Hindus' rings.¹⁸⁹ The *Maāsir-i-‘Ālamgīrī* assigns to the year 1693-1694 the order prohibiting the carrying of arms in public by the Hindus.¹⁹⁰

A further distinction was made between the Hindus and the Muslims in the matter of taxation. On 10 April 1665 it was ordered that the customs duties on the Muslims be fixed at 2½ per cent throughout the empire and at 5 per cent in the case of the Hindus.¹⁹¹ Manucci suggests that this concession, or rather a greater one, the total abolition of the customs duties to the Muslims, was Aurangzeb's thanksgiving after

his serious illness in 1662.¹⁹² However, as the concession was granted almost four years after Aurangzeb's recovery, the reason assigned does not seem to have been likely. The emperor soon found that even the levy of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the Muslims was unlawful. On 9 May 1667 orders were issued totally forbidding the levy of the tax on the Muslims.¹⁹³ This privilege was abused by the Muslim traders. The goods of the Hindus were passed on as belonging to the Muslims usually for a consideration.¹⁹⁴ Aurangzeb was then compelled to re-impose the tax on 5 March 1682¹⁹⁵ at the former rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the Muslims.

Further the tax on the produce from gardens was realised at the rate of 20 per cent from the Hindus and 16·6 per cent from the Muslims.¹⁹⁶

In the year 1669-70 (1080 A.H.) it was ordered that in a lunar year the Muslims should pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the price of their cattle, and the Hindus 5 per cent.¹⁹⁷

The minting charges also differed and were fixed in 1682 (1093 A.H.) at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for the Muslims and 5 per cent for the Hindus.¹⁹⁸ But the biggest difference lay in the imposition of the jizya.

Imposition and Collection of the Jizya

Much has been written on the principles underlying the imposition of the jizya by a Muslim king on his non-Muslim subjects. Its origin has been traced, its nature analysed, and its relation with the general religious policy of the Muslim kings investigated. But historical origins and theological justification need not tally with the actual practice of a particular king in India or elsewhere. In what follows an attempt is made at studying from the official papers the practice and policy followed by Aurangzeb when he re-imposed the jizya on the Hindus in April 1679.

To go back a little, the jizya had been exacted by the Muslim kings of India from their Hindu subjects ever since

the Arab conquest of Sind. At first the Brahmaus had been exempted but Firoz Shāh Tughlaq failed to find any justification for this exception. As a part of his general policy to make the kingdom of Delli conform as much as possible to his conception of an ideal Muslim state, he imposed this tax on the Brahmans as well. Thenceforth the tax was collected from Hindus of all classes till Akbar thought it fit to relieve his non-Muslim subjects of this humiliating burden. His successors pursued the same policy and continued this departure from contemporary Muslim practice.

But when Aurangzeb came to the throne, things took a different turn. Aurangzeb was a Puritan and was anxious to establish the kingdom of God on earth. He was a Muslim king and it seemed to him unreasonable not to govern the country according to his interpretation of the injunctions of the Qur'ān and tradition. He was determined, like all contemporary kings of Asia and Europe, to rule his kingdom as a servant of his God. To him Akbar's policy of toleration looked like an aberration just as, about the same time, Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence seemed obnoxious to his Christian subjects even though it granted toleration only to fellow Christians.

Akbar was an exception to his age. Aurangzeb was content to be normal. Further, Akbar's policy of toleration had not been willingly accepted by many of his officers and they had no enthusiasm for it. Thus there was no apprehension of opposition from the Mughal officialdom if a pious king chose to revert to the normal policy of the Muslim rulers of India. The Muslim theologians who constituted the only effective check on the despotic powers of the Muslim kings in India could not naturally be expected to oppose the designs of a king who looked up to them for advice and guidance. Thus everything favoured a change in policy.

Of course there remained the vast majority of Aurangzeb's Indian subjects, the Hindus. Aurangzeb fell into the error,

common to his century, of disregarding their wishes and interests.

By 1679 Aurangzeb had advanced so far on the path of Puritanism that it was possible for him to order the levy of the *jizya* on non-Muslims on the representation of 'Anāyat Khān, Dīwān-i-Khālṣa.¹⁹⁹ It was to be paid by all and sundry in Muslim India and Rajput States, by officials and non-officials, Brahmans and non-Brahmans, clerks and fighters. Aurangzeb's imposition differed from all earlier impositions in that it was laid on the persons living in feudatory states as well. The imposition was followed by a public protest by the Hindus at the capital and in the suburbs. They waited till Friday and when the emperor rode out on an elephant to say his Friday prayers in the Friday Mosque, they made a demonstration and blocked the path of the royal elephant. For some time Aurangzeb was non-plussed. As all efforts at securing a path for him failed, after a delay of an hour or so, he ordered the march to be resumed trampling under foot many of the protestants. Abu'l Fazl Māmūrī, who himself witnessed the incident, tells us that this continued for several days and many lost their lives fighting against the *jizya*.²⁰⁰ The *jizya* is said to have evoked a vigorous protest from Shivāji.²⁰¹

It has sometimes been asserted that the *jizya* was a substitute for military service which was obligatory on all Muslims. None has, however, explained what steps were taken by Muslim emperors in India, particularly the Mughal emperors, to enforce this conscription on the Muslim section of their subjects. Apart from theory, there is not a single case on record, as far as Indian history is concerned, to show that any Muslim ruler of India ever called upon all the faithful to rally to his standard for the defence of their possessions either against internal rebellion or foreign danger. But even if it was a substitute for military service at any time, it ceased to be so when it was levied upon the

Rajput rajas of Central India and Rajputana.²⁰² The appointment of the amīn of the jizya for the army can be explained only on the assumption that the Hindus in the imperial army paid the jizya.²⁰³ How else are we to account for the appointment of an amīn for the jizya accompanying the emperor? ²⁰⁴ In fact, there is nothing to suggest that the jizya was not levied upon the Hindus forming the fighting forces of the Mughal rulers.

It has been asserted that the officials did not pay this odious tax.²⁰⁵ But the actual practices of Aurangzeb's reign show that no exemption was made in favour of any class of Hindus as far as the payment of the jizya was concerned. Some Hindu officials, including a personal assistant to the provincial bakshī, a diwān, and an amīn of the court had, among others, delayed the payment of this tax in 1694. One of them pleaded that his Muslim superior was dangerously ill and that on account of his being busy with his affairs he could not pay the jizya personally and would like to send it by a deputy. His request was turned down. He was reminded that paying the jizya was a privilege and payment must, therefore, be made in person and as humbly as possible. There was no escape from this order. These officials came and paid the jizya in person as ordered.²⁰⁶

It was levied in the States as well. The *Jaipur Records* mention, that on 2 May 1688, postal messengers of Raja Rām Singh were asked to pay the tax when they reached Burhanpur. They refused to pay as they had already made the payment in Jaipur. Their letters were forcibly taken possession of, they were imprisoned and were released only when the matter was brought to the notice of the emperor. It was ordered, then, that all messengers, private and imperial, should be taxed only in the place of their residence and no demand should be made on them while carrying the post.²⁰⁷ In the jāgīrs, imperial officers were sent to collect

the tax. Of course their task was none too pleasant. Collection of a tax is always an unpleasant task and the levy of this widely hated tax very often created trouble. On 28 January 1693, for example, it was reported that the Amīn i-Jizya for the province of Malwa had sent a soldier in order to collect the jizya in the jāgīr of Devī Singh, son of Bīram Dev Sisodia. When he reached the place, Devī Singh's men fell upon him, pulled his beard and hair, and sent him back empty-handed. The emperor thereupon ordered a reduction in the jāgīr of Devī Singh.²⁰⁸

Earlier, however, another amīn had fared much worse. Not content with sending his men to the jāgīr of a mansabdār, he himself proceeded to his jāgīr. In the scuffle that followed his attempt at levying the tax, the mansabdār killed the amīn. The case was brought up before the emperor on 12 July 1684, whereupon the mansabdār was degraded.²⁰⁹

In 1682 the Hindus of Burhanpur were reported to have made the task of the collection of the jizya impossible. Mir 'Abdul Karīm was thereupon appointed to the office, and horsemen and foot soldiers were attached to his establishment in order to facilitate his work. The kotwāl was ordered to punish the defaulters. So rigorous were his exactions that instead of a total of Rs26,000 from the whole city, as in the past year, he was able to collect from one half of the city about Rs1,08,000 within two or three months. It was discovered however that his methods were none too popular, and he was transferred.²¹⁰

In 1689 and 1690, the jizya of Palanpur and Jalore in Gujarat was discovered to be in arrears. Officers had to be sent there in order to help the local amīn in the collection of this tax.²¹¹ Elsewhere Rāi Bhān created trouble for two years and made it impossible for any collections to be made. On 31 August 1703 his conduct was reported to the emperor.²¹²

The incidence of the *jizya* on the people was not inconsiderable. Sir Jadunath Sarkar has calculated that in the province of Gujarat it formed 4.42 per cent of the provincial revenues. Further we learn from the *Akhabārāt* that from Mander in Berar Rs30,000 had already been collected and the collections were still going on.²¹³ If Mander of our text is Manbah of the *Āin-i-Akbārī*, its revenue under Akbar was Rs20,000 only.²¹⁴ Under Aurangzeb, according to Sujān Rāi, the total revenues of the whole of the province of Berar amounted to Rs1,51,81,750²¹⁵ only which is very nearly the same as under Akbar.²¹⁶ Under Akbar it contained 142 parganas. The richest pargana contributed Rs6,27,868 as revenue²¹⁷ and the collection of Rs30,000 from this unidentified pargana would come to 4.76 per cent of the total revenues of the richest pargana in Berar. If we account for the collections that were still due, we would not be far from the truth in asserting that Sarkar's estimate for Gujarat underestimates the percentage that the *jizya* bore to the total revenues at least in the province of Berar.

An elaborate arrangement had to be made for the assessment and the collection of this tax.²¹⁸ A register of demand was prepared showing the amount due from every assessee.²¹⁹ When the collections began, the *amīn* for the pargana was authorised to call for help from the local officials, *kotwāls*, *qānūngoes*, and *thānadārs*.²²⁰ He reported the collections to the provincial *amīn*.²²¹ As we have already seen there was an *amīn* accompanying the royal court on march and separate officers were asked to accompany the armies sent on expeditions and collect the dues from soldiers. These officers usually did not occupy a very high rank in the Mughal hierarchy of officials. One of the *amīns* accompanying the emperor in 1702 was a *mansabdār* of three hundred horse.²²² The *amīn* of Khandesh was only a commander of 100, as those of Burhanpur, Hyderabad, and Muradabad. The *mansabdār* in Berar was more

fortunate and commanded 300, whereas the amin at Aurangabad enjoyed the rank of a commander of 250.²²³ The highest place occupied was the command of six hundred.²²⁴ The *Maāsir-i-‘Ālamgīrī* mentions the appointment of an amin supervising the work of all the provinces in the Deccan. As we have already seen, the work of these officers involved considerable risk including danger to life.

There were three grades of assessment.²²⁵ Those possessing property worth 200 dirhams (Rs52, i.e. silver weighing 51 tolas) 10 mashas and $7\frac{1}{3}$ grains paid 12 dirhams (Rs3-2) as the jizya.²²⁶ This works out at 6 per cent of the property.²²⁷ It was a capital levy capable of wiping out the whole capital in about 20 years. A money transaction dated 10 February 1704 states the rate of interest to be 4 per cent.²²⁸ This would mean that in the case of the poor, i.e. the owners of real property worth Rs52, the entire income from that property was taken away as the jizya. The second class consisted of those whose property ranged from Rs52 to Rs2,500 roughly. They were to pay 24 dirhams,²²⁹ i.e. Rs6-4 as the jizya. Rs2,500 at the rate of 4 per cent would yield Rs100, hence the jizya works out at $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent of the income. In such cases the jizya was at a much lower rate. Those whose property was worth more than 10,000 dirhams were very easily let off paying 48 dirhams irrespective of their income. The rich paid the whole amount in a lump sum, the middle classes had the option to pay the whole in one or two instalments, and the poor could pay it in four instalments. In 1692 it was laid down that in case of wilful evasion discovered the year after, the evader was to pay for both the years. When, however, non-payment was due to a clerical mistake on the part of the collecting agency, the jizya was to be paid only for a year.²³⁰

Of course certain classes of people were exempted. Minors, women, slaves of all kinds, the blind, the mentally deficient, unemployed cripples, and beggars were not to pay

the *jizya*. Those who remained ill for more than six months were also excused this imposition.²³¹

The tax-payer was to make the payments personally. He was to approach the platform on which the collector sat, stand opposite the collector who took it off the citizen. The collector was further warned never to think of remitting the dues.²³²

Remissions to localities were, however, sometimes granted. Sir Jadunath Sarkar has cited two cases where Aurangzeb refused to grant remission of the tax even when recommended by the local officials.²³³ Amānat Khān, Dīwān-i-Deccan, was very much given to granting remission of the arrears of the *jizya*. His rival Rashid Khān complained to the emperor that he had granted *sanads* of exemption to help the Hindu population liable to pay the *jizya*. Aurangzeb's wrath was roused. He told Amānat Khān whatever else he might remit, he should not remit the *jizya* which the emperor had succeeded in reimposing after so many difficulties. Amānat Khān never again granted exemptions.²³⁴

As against that we have the records of five cases wherein Aurangzeb granted, or was prepared to grant, remission of the tax to harrassed localities. On 12 December 1681 a petition from the inhabitants of Bahadurpura (?) was presented asking for the remission of the tax. Aurangzeb thereupon called for a detailed report on the subject the same day.²³⁵ Unfortunately there is no record of any further orders on the subject among the extant papers. The collections from Dahad (?) again were remitted for a year or two on the representation of its inhabitants and local officers.²³⁶ On 19 February 1704 the collection of the *jizya* was stopped throughout the Mughal provinces of the Deccan on account of the difficulties caused by Maratha raids.²³⁷ On 12 November 1704 collection of the tax was forbidden in Deval Ghat for three years.²³⁸ After the

conquest of Hyderabad its *jizya* along with certain other charges was remitted.²³⁹ How long the remission continued it is difficult to say. It could only have been of a temporary nature. We are told, however, by another contemporary writer that after its conquest by Aurangzeb, the *jizya* was levied and collected by force in the Deccan.²⁴⁰ Thus it is clear that Aurangzeb was not always 'deaf to the pleadings of pity and political expediency alike' in levying the *jizya*. Cases of remissions were decided as occasion arose, and it is difficult to come to the conclusion that Aurangzeb was unduly harsh or obstinate in this respect.

Thus the *jizya* formed a part of the avowed policy of Aurangzeb to govern according to the Islamic law. He did not stop to consider how it would affect his non-Muslim subjects. If they resented its imposition, he could not be false to his ideals. If the poorer among them discovered that it took away the bulk of their income and thus rendered it impossible for them to maintain themselves, that was none of his business. If they wanted to evade its payment, the way was open to them. They could accept the true faith and escape this burden if they found it too irksome to bear. But it is difficult to decide how many of the conversions were due solely or mainly to the burden of the *jizya* which was pressing so heavily on the poorer classes.

It is well to remember, however, that the *jizya* was levied by Aurangzeb at a time when toleration was an exception rather than the rule in the state-craft of the world. It was not necessarily the outcome of any feeling of dislike that Aurangzeb entertained towards the Hindus or their faith. It was imposed because the conception of the Islamic State with which Aurangzeb was familiar made it obligatory for him to do so. He was usually not more strict in the realization of this particular tax and although it formed a heavy burden on the poorer classes, the wealthier section did not find it exceptionally irksome. To Aurangzeb it was nothing

less than the price of toleration that a non-believer was naturally expected to pay in a Muslim State.

Hindu Converts to Islam

The annals of Aurangzeb's reign furnish an interesting list of Hindus who were converted to Islam. The proselytizing activity of Aurangzeb seems to have started about the year 1666 and remained unabated till the end of his life. A list compiled after an exhaustive study of the original sources of his reign, more particularly the *News Letters* and the correspondence of the period forms an appendix to this chapter. Here it is necessary to take notice of some typical cases only.

In April 1667 the cases of four revenue collectors (qanungoes) were brought up before the emperor. They had been dismissed for various faults. On 22 April 1667 it was reported that they had expiated their shortcomings by accepting the true faith whereupon the emperor was pleased to order their reinstatement.²⁴¹

On 26 January 1670 one Chandā submitted that he was a collateral of Budh Prakāsh, a zamīndār. He declared, he was willing to become a Muslim, if Budh Prakāsh be set aside and the zamīndārī be assigned to Chandā. Aurangzeb was prepared to accept this time-serving convert, but the minister, Asad Ullah Khān, opposed this manifestly unjust deposition of an innocent zamīndār.²⁴²

Bhūpat Singh requested that his brother Murārī Dās be given the vacant chieftainship of Choki Garh. Aurangzeb at once used the occasion for attempting a conversion and ordered that Murārī Dās be made the chief of Choki Garh if he accepted Islam. It seems that Murārī Dās resisted the temptation held forth to him.²⁴³

A brother of the zamīndār of Dev Garh accepted Islam and was given the name of Islām Yār. He was at once put into the possession of the zamīndārī, superseding the

existing chief. A sister of his also followed suit. We find that this estate at last served the purpose of a bait for swelling the ranks of contemporary Muslims. Zorāwar Singh and Shayām Singh were made joint chiefs of Choki Garh after their conversion to Islam on 15 Ramazan of the sixteenth year of the reign.²⁴⁴

Devī Chand, a zamīndār of Manohar Pur, had been dispossessed of his chieftainship and dismissed from his mansab. On 12 July 1681 he accepted Islam, whereupon he was restored to his rank of a commander of 250 and also given back his estate.²⁴⁵

On 26 September 1681 an order was issued that all prisoners who would accept Islam be set at liberty.²⁴⁶

Lājpat, amin and fojdār of Ram Garh, owed the state some money. He could not make arrangements for its payment and was therefore imprisoned. While in prison the light of the true faith dawned on him and he submitted that if he be released, he would accept Islam. Orders were at once given for his release. He was brought to the imperial court and on 15 January 1704 the emperor personally initiated him into the true faith. His delinquencies were forgotten and his mansab was increased from a commander of 250 to 400.²⁴⁷

A letter of Aurangzeb's recalls a very interesting case. Raja Islām Khān was a convert from Hinduism. He had, so Aurangzeb declared, promised to bring his mother, sister and several others into the true faith before his conversion. Nothing probably was heard of in this connexion later on. Aurangzeb therefore caused it to be known that if his sister were willing to accept Islam, she would be married to a grandson of the emperor.²⁴⁸

Rāo Gopāl Singh of Rampur was an imperial mansabdār. He was accompanying Aurangzeb's army in the Deccan and had left his son, Rattan Singh, in the State. The son created trouble in the administration and became a source of grave

anxiety to his father. Gopāl Singh, thereupon, complained to the emperor and submitted that his son be recalled to the Deccan. Aurangzeb remained silent. To avoid the consequences of his conduct, Rattan Singh had become a convert through the governor of Malwa, who put him in possession of the State. When the father reached his State at last, he found his Muslim son in occupation. Gopāl Singh then sought refuge with the Rana. Naturally this preferment of Rattan Singh at his conversion produced a very strong effect. Many members of the younger generation among the Rajputs saw therein an easy way of acquiring territory.²⁴⁹

The Raja of Palamau was offered better terms if he would accept Islam.²⁵⁰

A daughter of Raja Anūp Singh Rāthor was married to Mu'azzam. She was first brought to the palace and there converted.²⁵¹

Probably the most sensational case of the reign was that of Netojī. He was Shivājī's commander-in-chief. When the Maratha raja surrendered, along with Sambhājī, Netojī was given a command of 5,000. When Shivājī escaped from Agra, Aurangzeb sent orders to Raja Jai Singh to capture Netojī and to send him to the imperial court as a prisoner. Raja Jai Singh carried out his orders and Netojī was sent to Agra. There he seems to have been kept a close prisoner. At last in the words of Abu'l Fazl Māmūrī, he sought release by embracing Islam,²⁵² though the official annalist would have us believe that he was a willing convert.²⁵³ He was thereupon liberated and given a mansab of 3,500. Later on he left the Mughal service and went back to Shivājī. There not only was he taken back into the Hindu fold, but Shivājī exalted him by giving him his own daughter in marriage.²⁵⁴

On the North-West Frontier some forty miles from Jalalabad, the inhabitants were converted at the point of the bayonet.²⁵⁵

A Hindu clerk killed the Muslim seducer of his sister. He was compelled to become a Muslim.²⁵⁶

It is not surprising to find Tavernier declaring, 'Under the cover of the fact that the rulers are Muslims, they persecute these poor idolators to the utmost and if any of the latter become Muslim, it is in order not to work any more'.²⁵⁷

A letter, written by the President and the Council of Surat on 22 January 1668, suggests a rather ingenious method of making converts. The factors state that trade had been largely obstructed by the fierce bigotry of Aurangzeb and his persecution of the Hindus. 'If a Muhammadan had no desire to discharge his debt to the bania and if the bania demanded the payment of the same, the Muhammadan would lodge a complaint to the Kazi that he had called the prophet names or spoken contumaciously of their religion, produce a false witness or two, and the poor man was forced to circumcision and made to embrace Islam. Several persons had been thus served to the great terror of all. This king not at all minding anything of his kingdom gives himself wholly upon the converting or rather perverting the banias.' Forceful conversion of the Hindus at Surat at last drove them to plans of migrating from Surat to Bombay. The English, however, turned down their request. The Hindus then closed their shops at Surat and eight thousand of them marched on to Broach to the emperor who was supposed to be there.²⁵⁸ What became of their appeal we do not know.

A study of these cases brings to light the several methods used by Aurangzeb for the purpose of making converts. Whenever two claimants to a property quarrelled, the most approved method of proving one's title was to become a convert. This provided the most conclusive argument which nothing could upset. Of course the recorded cases only refer to such important disputes as were brought before the

emperor. It is unlikely, however, that this 'case made law' of the emperor was not followed by the lower courts who had to deal with minor disputes. Thus worldly advancement was placed as a bait before likely candidates for conversion and it would not be unreasonable to attribute a large number of conversions to this factor. Another method was to make terms with the convicts or suspects. Whatever might be a man's crime, he could expiate for it by becoming a Muslim. Rebels thus could wash off their rebellions, felons their felonies, whereas the minor crimes of embezzlement and defalcation could be easily compounded by ontry into the charmed circle of the faithful. Economic pressure was also used frankly for the purpose of making converts. The *jizya* hit the poorest classes hardest and the Hindu traders paid higher taxes. War was used as a convenient weapon for the purpose of extending the faith and prisoners of war often swelled the ranks of the faithful. The converts, whatever their earlier failings, were always sure of a place at the court, in the imperial secretariat, and in the revenue or the accounts department. In certain cases 'forcible conversions' were also effected.

Popular Hindu and Sikh tradition ascribes mass conversions by force to Aurangzeb's reign. Of course it has heightened the colours in the picture. But the examples quoted above prove that the emperor made it a part of his imperial duty to encourage conversions, personally admit converts to Islam and grant favours to the initiated. Of the converts it must be said that very few, if any, seem to have changed their faith for religious reasons. Desire to escape civic disabilities or worse, and acquire material benefits formed the motive force in most cases. It may be argued that the religion which these converts shook off so easily must have been sitting very lightly on them. But the history of the world contains a few martyrs and a host of trimmers. Hindu India of Aurangzeb's reign was no

exception. The wonder is not that so many were converted but that the vast majority of the Hindus kept their faith amidst so many temptations and such persecution.

Aurangzeb and the Sikhs

Aurangzeb's relations with the Sikhs raise some controversial questions. When Aurangzeb entered upon the War of Succession, Guru Har Rāi was the leader of the Sikhs. After the battle of Samugarh, Dārā left for the Punjab and is said to have waited upon the guru whose admirer he had been.²⁵⁹ The guru promised him aid and actually brought together a body of Sikh soldiers for his help. But when desertions began to take place among the alleged supporters of the unfortunate prince, the guru also deserted him.²⁶⁰

After his accession to the throne, Aurangzeb summoned the guru to answer for his conduct.²⁶¹ The guru, however, refused to wait upon the emperor in person but thought it politic to conciliate him by sending his son Rām Rāi to the court.²⁶² He was accompanied by two elders of the Sikh community so that he might not deviate from the true path. Rām Rāi so deported himself at the capital that the emperor was very much pleased with him. Whether this involved performing miracles as Bakht Mall suggests²⁶³ or interpreting a text from the *Ādi Granth* to Aurangzeb's satisfaction,²⁶⁴ or both,²⁶⁵ is doubtful. Rather than be pleased at his son's diplomatic conduct, Har Rāi, the guru, marked his disapproval thereof by disinheriting him and appointing his minor son Har Kishan as his successor. Har Rāi died on Karttika 9, Kṛṣṇapakṣa, 1718 A.V.²⁶⁶ (November 1661).

Har Kishan succeeded his father. He was yet a minor. Rām Rāi preferred his claim before the emperor and had the guru summoned to the court. Rather unwillingly the boy guru was taken to the capital by his followers. There he put up at the house of a faithful adherent. But

smallpox claimed him as its victim and he died on Friday, 9 April 1665.²⁶⁷

Aurangzeb had meanwhile given in jāgīr the present site of Dehra Dun to Rām Rāi.²⁶⁸ Here he built a temple and became the leader of such Sikhs as were prepared to accept his authority. Har Kishan had, however, left his disciples in a fix as to his successor. He had told them that the Bābā of Bakala would be his successor. But there were many Bābās (descendants of the gurus) in Bakala and each claimed to be the successor designated. Tegh Bahādur, a younger son of Guru Hargōvind and the grandfather of Har Kishan was at last accepted as the ninth guru.²⁶⁹ After a life spent in journeying in various parts of India, Guru Tegh Bahādur settled at Kiratpur in the present district of Hoshiarpur in the Punjab. Here he seems to have been arrested by imperial officials and brought to the capital. Aurangzeb ordered his execution on 11 December 1675.²⁷⁰ This judicial execution has been attributed to various causes by different historians. A Muslim writer attributes it to Tegh Bahādur's refusal to become a Muslim.²⁷¹ Bakht Mall ascribes it to the guru's refusal to perform a miracle and is borne out by the account given in the biographies of the gurus written by the tenth guru, Gobind Singh.²⁷² It seems likely that the guru was arrested as a man who claimed to possess miraculous powers.

The execution of Guru Tegh Bahādur proved a baptism of fire. It helped his son and successor Guru Gobind Singh to transform the Sikhs into the fiery warriors they proved themselves in the eighteenth century. But for several years after Guru Tegh Bahādur's execution, the emperor, who had left for the south in 1680, left the Sikhs alone. Then towards the end of the year 1693 Aurangzeb heard that Guru Gobind Singh was claiming to be an incarnation of Guru Nānak. He issued an order on 20 November 1693, that the guru be admonished.²⁷³ This does not seem to have produced

much effect. It was soon reported to the emperor that the Sikhs had caused a good deal of disturbance round Lahore and a general order for their massacre was issued.²⁷⁴

A Sikh at Agra threw a stone at the emperor while he was returning from his Friday prayers in the public mosque.²⁷⁵ The Sikh was arrested and must have been subsequently punished.

In the sarkar of Sirhind a temple of the Sikhs was demolished to give place to a mosque. The Sikhs in their own turn pulled down the mosque and killed the imām who had been appointed to lead the faithful in their prayers.²⁷⁶

Further trouble from the 'infidel worshippers of Nānak' was apprehended and orders were sent by Lutf Khān, son of Asad Khān, to Khudāyār Khān to send his contingent under his son to help Khwāja Husain Khān who had been appointed to put an end to the Sikh disturbances.²⁷⁷

The battle of Chamkaur between the Sikhs and the imperialists is also spoken of in one of Aurangzeb's letters when artillery from Sirhind was ordered to be mobilised for the imperial attack.²⁷⁸

When prince Mu'azzam was appointed governor of Multan in 1696, some understanding seems to have been arrived at between the prince and the Sikh guru. The prince arranged matters in such a way that the guru made up his quarrel with the Mughal government, advising his followers to pay unto Caesar what was his due.²⁷⁹

When the guru was at last compelled to leave Anandpur two of his sons fell into the hands of the Muslims. They were asked to embrace Islam and on their refusal they were buried alive in a wall of Sirhind. This laid the foundation of another feud between the Sikhs and the Mughals which was later on made use of by Banda so successfully against Aurangzeb's successors.

Some time after this 20,000 Sikhs were killed while they were going to the country of Bārکزai Afghans. Their

Muslim escort fell on them in co-operation with other Muslim fanatics.²⁸⁰ We do not know the circumstances which compelled the Sikhs to leave the Punjab and go to these rugged districts on the frontier. It might have been due to their persecution by the Muslim rulers in the Punjab.

Aurangzeb issued orders to prince Shāh 'Ālam to imprison the Sikhs and expel them from the districts under his command.²⁸¹

Thus, though later on the guru made peace with Aurangzeb, his reign seems to have bequeathed a tradition of hostility between the Sikhs and the Mughal Government. The Sikhs handed down the bitter memory of the execution of the ninth guru and the burying alive of the tenth guru's two sons.

Aurangzeb's Failure

(Aurangzeb tried to accomplish the impossible task of serving Mammon and God alike. He continued ruling over a vast empire and tried to serve his God as well. Unfortunately for him, the Muslim tradition of government had never had to deal with a vast majority of non-Muslim subjects who could not be easily converted.) Still more unfortunately he refused to take notice of Akbar's practices because he regarded them as innovations. The result was that the comprehensive state of Akbar's reign gave place to the Muslim state of pre-Akbar days. With this change in its structure it is not surprising that it shared the same fate. The pre-Akbar Muslim state in India had no hold on the vast majority of its subjects whose active loyalty it had never been able to secure. Naturally three centuries of Indian history (1194-1526) had seen the rise and the fall of several Muslim dynasties in Delhi—the Ghoris, the Slaves, the Khiljīs, the Tughlaqs, the Sayyids and the Lodis. Their average life had not been more than sixty years. Aurangzeb could hope to fare no better. { His religious policy lost him

the active loyalty of his Hindu subjects. As under the sultanate, they were not concerned what particular label the ruling dynasty bore. They ceased to be interested in the fate of their rulers as they knew that it would make no difference to them. Aurangzeb thus destroyed the *raison d'être* of the Mughal dynasty.)

(But all this happened in the seventeenth century. Aurangzeb was no worse than the Cavalier Parliament in England which passed the Clarendon Code. His legislation lagged far behind that manifestation of the collective wisdom of the English at that time.) He did not interfere with the celebration of private religious worship of his Hindu subjects. He did not forbid their priests teaching Hindus. He did not exclude them from the public services.

Aurangzeb erred in common with most of the contemporary rulers of the world. If his church was that of a minority, so was the Protestant church in Ireland. If he levied the *jizya* on the majority of his subjects, the preponderant majority of the Roman Catholics in Ireland went on paying the tithes for the support of the alien Protestant church legally till the thirties of the nineteenth century but virtually till 1867. For almost everything that he did, he could find an excuse in the state policy of his times.

But he had less of an excuse for departing from the path shown by Akbar. Elsewhere the state had not out-grown its thralldom of the church and treated the aliens in the state church as aliens in the state as well. This of course was the result of the fact that the state had been nursed in its early stages by the church and there had been a close alliance between the two. As Froude put it, at that time when men quarrelled about religion, they quarrelled about everything else. Toleration was supposed to be dangerous to the safety of the country. But Akbar had shown here in India that a policy of religious toleration was far from being dangerous to the state. (It had really consolidated

the Mughal state in India. With that demonstration before him, when Aurangzeb embarked upon a policy of religious persecution in India, he allowed the religious fanatic to get the upper hand of the king. In this respect he resembled Charles X of France who tried to make the state priest-ridden with the same disastrous effects to his own fortunes. Aurangzeb had not the English Puritan's excuse for his religious policy. If Cromwell persecuted the Anglicans it was partly because they were dangerous to the state. Aurangzeb had no such suspicions, let alone fears.)

NOTES

- 1 Khāfi Khān, II, 551-3.
- 2 Khāfi Khān, II, 8, Kāzim, 388-9.
- 3 Cf. Kāzim's accounts of various festivities on these occasions.
- 4 Cf. *Frāmān-i-Salāṭin*. Marshall describes the Mughal king's year as divided into Hāhī months; cf., p. 277.
- 5 *Akhabārāt* of 19 February 1667 and 5 November 1671.
- 6 Kāzim, 390.
- 7 Khāfi Khān, II, 212, 561.
- 8 Khāfi Khān, II, 564.
- 9 *Bahārīstān-i-Ghaibī*, the present writer's summary in the *Journal of Indian History*, XIV, 78.
- 10 Khāfi Khān and *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī* describe these yearly functions. Ovington, who was in Surat in 1680, says that on 5 November, every year, the emperor was weighed, 109.
- 11 Khāfi Khān, II, 549.
- 12 *Letters*, No. 18.
- 13 *Inshā-i-Mādhorām*, 12, 44-5.
- 14 Khāfi Khān, II, 77; Kāzim, 366.
- 15 Kāzim, 868, 914.
- 16 *Akhabārāt*, 1 January 1662.
- 17 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 176.
- 18 Khāfi Khān, II, 214-15.
- 19 *News Letter*, 20 August 1681.
- 20 *ibid.*, 5 November 1671.
- 21 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 352.
- 22 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 162.
- 23 Khāfi Khān, II, 8; Kāzim, 391-2.
- 24 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 281.
- 25 Khāfi Khān, II, 220.
- 26 *News Letter*, 2 April 1693.
- 27 *Letters*, No. 90.
- 28 *Letters*, No. 71.
- 29 *News Letter*, 6 May 1702.
- 30 *News Letter*, 28 February 1703.
- 31 *News Letter*, 14 August 1703.
- 32 *News Letter*, 6 June 1705.
- 33 Ja'far Khān who was for seven long years the imperial wazīr (1663-1670) was publicly known to drink. On Aurangzeb's remonstrating with him, he declared that 'by drinking wine he got sight for seeing, power for wielding the pen in the service of his Majesty, felt strength in his feet to run to court when his Majesty called'. (Manucci, II, 157). A letter to Muhammad, ṇsaf mutasaddī of a palace at Agra, warned him against the prevalent sale of drinks in the area under his control and called upon him to take action against the offenders on pain of imperial displeasure. (*Inshā-i-Mādhorām*, 83, 84). We find Dāūd Khan, sent in command of an expedition to the Karnatic in 1701, drinking openly to the health of the King of England. (*A Pepsy of Mughal India*, 299). Cf. Manucci, II, 5-8, 548; and Ovington, 141. Tavernier, I, 95, mentions that one could obtain wine at Lahore. He emptied two bottles of Shiraz wine in the open street at Patna, 'because in this country one lives without ceremony and with perfect liberty' (I, 122).
- 34 *Mīrāt-ul-Khayyāl*, 298.

- 35 *Inshā-i-Mādhori*, 59.
 36 Manucci, II, 6.
 37 *ibid.*, II, 5-8.
 38 *ibid.*, II, 9; *ʿAzamī*, 196.
 39 *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 250; Orme, Notes, 85.
 40 *ibid.*, I, 263.
 41 Ovington, 153.
 42 Manucci, II, 9; *Dastūr-ul-ʿAmal*, 103a; Ovington, 201. Tavernier, II, 210-16; Manucci, III, 156, Manucci, II, 60-1, 65-6. We are told however that widows who have no children should burn themselves on the funeral pyre. 'For, as for the widows who have children they are not permitted under any circumstances to burn themselves with the bodies of their husbands, it is ordained that they shall live in order to watch over the education of their children.' Tavernier, II, 210-16; Manucci, III, 156, Manucci, II, 60-1, 65-6, 68, and 156 tell us that the Brahman widows always burnt themselves at the funeral pyres of their husbands but that among the trading classes, the custom was not so common. Cf. Marshall, 384.
 43 *Maāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, 75.
 44 *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 282. This order was issued on 25 June 1672. It seem. to have been a sort of circular letter.
 45 *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 247.
 46 Manucci, II, 7.
 47 *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 251.
 48 Manucci, II, 8.
 49 *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, Supplement, English Translation, 70.
 50 Khāfi Khān, II, 564.
 51 *ibid.*, II, 561.
 52 *Kalimāt-i-Tayyibāt*, 77a.
 53 Banar, II, 7-8.
 54 *Maāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, 79.
 55 *ibid.*, 162.
 56 *Ālāb-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, Letter No. 565.
 57 *News Letter*, 7 August 1681.
 58 *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 262.
 59 *ibid.*, I, 263.
 60 *ibid.*, I, 263.
 61 *ibid.*, Supplement, 110.
 62 *ibid.*, I, 323-4.
 63 Manucci, IV, 118-21.
 64 *News Letter*, 7 July 1694.
 65 *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*, 165.
 66 Khāfi Khān, II, 213-14.
 67 *Akḥabārāt*; 28 August 1700.
 68 *Akḥabārāt*; 17 July 1700.
 69 Manucci, II, 160.
 70 *Maāsir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, 120.
 71 *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*, 165.
 72 *ibid.*, *Khazānā-i-ʿĀmra*, 328.
 73 Manucci, III, 132.
 74 *Mīrāt-ul-Khayyāl*, 191; *Da-bistān-i-Mazāhib*, 242, 243.
 75 *Islamic Culture*, VII, 670.
 76 *Aurangzeb Nāma*, 45b; *Mīrāt-ul-Khayyāl*, 191, 192; *Riāz-us-Shuʿra*; *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*, 172; Bernier, 317.
 77 *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*, 161, 162.
 78 *Mīrāt-ul-Khayyāl*, 175-8.
 79 *ibid.*, 195-6.
 80 *ibid.*, 226-7.
 81 *ibid.*, 209.
 82 *ibid.*, 238-9. Tavernier, I, 356; *Mīrāt-i-Aḥmadī*, I, 248.
 83 *Bādshāh-nāma*, Wāris, 70.
 84 *Zawābat-i-ʿĀlamgīrī*, 15a, f.
 85 Kāzīm, 1036.
 86 *ibid.*, 618.
 87 *Aḥkām-i-ʿĀlamgīrī* (MS) 72a, f.
 88 *ibid.*, 5(b).
 89 *Kalimāt-i-Aurangzeb*, 223.
 90 *News Letter*, 10 May 1703, *Kalimāt*, 153.

- 91 *Vir Vinod*, IV, 426.
- 92 Kāzim, 618.
- 93 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 154; *Jaipur Records*, II, Nos. 25, 41; *News Letter*, 30 December 1681.
- 94 *Jaipur Records*, VI, letter of 2 July 1691.
- 95 Kāzim, 625.
- 96 *ibid.*, 1,000.
- 97 See the present writer's article in *Islamic Culture*, Hyderabad, January, 1935.
- 98 *News Letter*, 19 September 1694.
- 99 *Kalimāt*, Letter No. 34; cf. Manucci, II, 154.
- 100 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 528.
- 101 Khāfi Khān, II, 249.
- 102 *Letters of Aurangzeb*, letter No. 33; *News Letter*, 28 July 1694.
- 103 Khāfi Khān, II, 252.
- 104 Cf. below.
- 105 Khāfi Khān, II, 252.
- 106 *News Letter*, 27 July 1703.
- 107 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, 11.
- 108 *News Letter* (Provincial, Gujarat), Sha'bān 3, year 46.
- 109 *News Letter*, 19 November 1702. Cf. *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, 1, 354.
- 110 Khāfi Khān, II, 503.
- 111 *JASB.*, 1911, p. 1789; cf. the text in the *Twentieth Century*, II, 2.
- 112 Kāzim, 659.
- 113 *ibid.*, 697; Khāfi Khān, II, 136, 152.
- 114 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, Supplement, English translation, 120.
- 115 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 259-60.
- 116 *Muraqāt-i-Hasan*, 202.
- 117 *News Letter* of the same date.
- 118 Manucci, II, 154.
- 119 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 81.

120 Orme's *Fragment*, Notes, 85, translated from French.

121 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 94.

122 *ibid.*, 88. Cf. however the following contemporary account of the destruction of the Hindu temples at Benares.

'The infidels demolished a mosque that was under construction and wounded the artisans. When the news reached Shāh Yāsīn, he came to Benares from Mandyawa and collecting the Muslim weavers, demolished the big temple. A Sayyid who was an artisan by profession agreed with one Abdul Rasūl to build a mosque at Benares and accordingly the foundation was laid. Near the place there was a temple and many houses belonging to it were in the occupation of the Rajputs. The infidels decided that the construction of a mosque in the locality was not proper and that it should be razed to the ground. At night the walls of the mosque were found demolished. Next day the wall was rebuilt but it was again destroyed. This happened three or four times. At last the Sayyid hid himself in a corner. With the advent of night the infidels came to achieve their nefarious purpose. When Abdul Rasūl gave the alarm, the infidels began to fight and the Sayyid was wounded by the Rajputs. In the meantime, the Musalman residents of the neighbourhood arrived at the spot and the infidels took to their heels. The wounded Muslims were taken to Shāh Yāsīn who determined to vindicate

- the cause of Islam. When he came to the mosque, people collected from the neighbourhood. The civil officers were outwardly inclined to side with the saint, but in reality they were afraid of the royal displeasure on account of the raja, who was a courtier of the emperor and had built the temple (near which the mosque was under construction). Shāh Yāsīn, however, took up the sword and started for Jihad. The civil officers sent him a message that such a grave step should not be taken without the emperor's permission. Shāh Yāsīn, paying no heed, sallied forth till he reached Bazar Chau Khamba through a fusillade of stones The doors (of temples) were forced open and the idols thrown down. The weavers and other Musalmans demolished about 500 temples. They desired to destroy the temple of Beni Madho, but as lanes were barricaded, they desisted from going further.' (*Gunj-i-Arshadī* quoted in Faruki, 127-8.)
- 123 *Mīrāt-ul-Khayyāl*. The paging of the copy I consulted is defective here.
- 124 *Travels of Abdul Latif*, 34-5.
- 125 *ibid.*, 34.
- 126 Munucei, II, 110; *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 95-6; *Mīrāt-ul-Khayyāl*, 101-2.
- 127 Ojha, *History of Udaipur*, I, 35.
- 128 *English Factories in India*, XIII, 141.
- 129 *News Letter*, 27 March 1670.
- 130 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 261.
- 131 *History of Dacca*, I, 372 quoted by Sarkar.
- 132 *News Letter*, 8 March 1679.
- 133 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 175.
- 134 *ibid.*, 186, 188-9.
- 135 *Adāb-i-Ālamgīrī*, letters No. 732 and 744.
- 136 *Īshar Dās*, f. 79b; *Rajaprasasti*, XXII, verse 29; *Jaipur Records*, XIII, 72-4.
- 137 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 194.
- 138 *Jaipur Records*, II, 161.
- 139 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 194.
- 140 *Jaipur Records*, III, 41.
- 141 *News Letter*, 21 May 1681.
- 142 *Jaipur Records*, letter of 18 September 1681.
- 143 *News Letter*, 27 September 1681.
- 144 *News Letter*, 13 October 1681.
- 145 Khāfi Khān, II, 343.
- 146 Khāfi Khān II, 359.
- 147 *ibid.*, II, 385.
- 148 *News Letter*, 14 April 1692.
- 149 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 328-9.
- 150 *Jaipur Records*, XVI, 58.
- 151 *ibid.*, XVII, 58.
- 152 *ibid.*, X, 174-83.
- 153 *News Letter*, 20 November 1693.
- 154 *ibid.*, 3 April 1699.
- 155 *ibid.*, 23 June 1694.
- 156 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 354.
- 157 *News Letter*, 2 January 1705.
- 158 *ibid.*, 2 March 1705.
- 159 *Archaeological Survey Report*, VII, 31-4.
- 160 *ibid.*, VII, 85-6.
- 161 *ibid.*, VII, 93.
- 162 *Kalimāt*, 128.
- 163 *Kalimāt-i-Tayyibāt*, 115.
- 164 Khāfi Khān, II, 651-2.
- 165 Hasan, 172.
- 166 *Jaipur Records*, X, 42.

- 167 *Kalimāt Aurangzeb* (Ram Puri), 34.
- 168 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, Supplement, English translation 121.
- 169 Manucci, II, 144.
- 170 *ibid.*, III, 245.
- 171 *ibid.*, 244.
- 172 *Archaeological Survey Report*, VII, 204-5, 244.
- 173 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, Supplement, English translation, 137.
- 174 Manucci, II, 82. It was collected at Allahabad at the rate of Rs 6.4 per head.
- 175 Bernier, 303.
- 176 *News Letter*, 20 November 1685 and 1 April 1692. Manucci II, 154.
- 177 *Aurangzeb*, III, 280n.
- 178 Cf. the present writer's article on *Raja Bhim Singh of Banera in Islamic Culture*, Hyderabad.
- 179 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 261.
- 180 *News Letter*, Agra 8 May 1693.
- 181 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 261.
- 182 *News Letter*, Gujarat, 22.
- 183 *ibid.*, 16 April 1696.
- 184 *Kalimāt-i-Tayyibāt*, Letter No. 109.
- 185 *Ahkām-i-Ālamgīrī* (Ram Puri), 68a.
- 186 *News Letter*, 11 December 1694.
- 187 *ibid.*, 18 April 1696.
- 188 *ibid.*, 17 March 1703.
- 189 *ibid.*, 3 November 1702.
- 190 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī* (Urdu), 262-3.
- 191 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 158, 259.
- 192 Manucci, VI, 619.
- 193 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 265.
- 194 Khāfi Khān, VI, 230-1.
- 195 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 298-9.
- 196 *News Letter*, 8 June 1685. De Graaf heard of the trade taxes on the Muslims early in 1670. Orme's *Fragment*, notes, p. 80. De Graaf says that this was done with a view to compel the non-muslims to accept Islam.
- 197 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 275.
- 198 *ibid.*, I, 304.
- 199 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī* suggests that the theologians took the initiative in the matter and represented to Aurangzeb the anomaly of the non-believers being exempted from the payment of the *jizya* under a king of Aurangzeb's piety. *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 174; *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 296-8. *Khallaq-us-Sayyag*, 52-6; *Zawābat-i-Ālamgīrī*, 656-67a ff. Ma'mūrī, 525.
- If Manucci is to be believed, some of the highly placed and important men at court opposed the imposition of the *jizya*. It was Aurangzeb's intention to use it for spreading the Muslim religion among his subjects. The Begam Sāhiba opposed it. There was an earthquake some time after and some of the courtiers are said to have once again urged Aurangzeb to retract his steps. Manucci, III, 288-91.
- 200 Ma'mūrī, 525-6.
- 201 *Khatūt-i-Shivājī*, cf. the English translation in *Aurangzeb* III, 325-9.
- 202 *The Court Bulletin* of Aurangzeb's court of 3 August 1687. A little different version of the above letter is said to have been written by Rāj Singh as well.
- 203 *Court Bulletin*, 14 July 1702.
- 204 *News Letter*, 12 July 1702.
- 205 *History of Aurangzeb*, III, 270, cf. *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*.

- 206 *News Letter* (Provincial, Agra), 8 May 1691.
- 207 *Jaipur Records*, X, 18-20.
- 208 *News Letter*, 28 January 1703.
- 209 *ibid.*, 18 July 1691.
- 210 Khāfi Khān, II, 278-9, 339.
- 211 *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 325.
- 212 *News Letter*, 31 August 1703.
- 213 *ibid.*, 24 May 1695.
- 214 *Āin-i-Akbarī*, II, 233n.
- 215 *Khulasat-ut-Tawārīkh*, 52.
- 216 *Āin-i-Akbarī*, II, 231.
- 217 *ibid.*, II, 236.
- 218 *Zawabāt-i-Ālamgīrī*, *Khallāq-us-Sayyāq*, 34.
- 219 *Jaipur Records*, IX, 148-9.
- 220 *ibid.*, IX, 148-9.
- 221 *Court Bulletin*, 11 July 1694.
- 222 *ibid.*, 14 April 1703.
- 223 *ibid.*, 19 February 1704.
- 224 *ibid.*, 1 July 1694.
- 225 Sarkar, III, 270.
- 226 *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 206.
- 227 Cf. Sarkar, III, 270, who erroneously estimates it at 6% of annual income.
- 228 *Jaipur Records*, XVI, 33.
- 229 *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 296.
- 230 *ibid.*, 304.
- 231 *ibid.*, 297.
- 232 *ibid.*, 297, *Court Bulletin* (Agra), 8 May 1634.
- 233 *Aurangzeb*, III, 272-3. He bases his statements on Khāfi Khān in one case and *Ahkām-i-Ālamgīrī* in the other.
- 234 Khāfi Khān, II, 377-8.
- 235 *Court Bulletin* of the same date.
- 236 *Ahkām-i-Ālamgīrī*, MS. 13b.
- 237 *Court Bulletin*, 19 February 1704.
- 238 *ibid.*, 12 November 1704.
- 239 Ishwar Dās's *Patāhāt-i-Ālamgīrī*, MS. 111(b).
- 240 Bhīm Sen, *Nushka-i-Dilkushā* MS. 139b.
- 241 *News Letter*, 22 April 1667.
- 242 *ibid.*, 26 January 1670.
- 243 *Ahkām-i-Ālamgīrī*, 197b.
- 244 *News Letter*, Ramzan 15, sixteenth regnal year.
- 245 *News Letter*, 12 July 1680.
- 246 *ibid.*, 26 September 1681.
- 247 *ibid.*, 15 January 1704.
- 248 *Kalīmāt*, Letter No. 109.
- 249 *Nushka-i-Dilkusha*, 130a, 146b.
- 250 *Ālamgīr Nāma*, 655.
- 251 *ibid.*, 648.
- 252 Khāfi Khān, II, 207.
- 253 *Ālamgīr Nāma*, 971-2, 987.
- 254 *Marāthī Riyāsat*, I, 490. Khāfi Khān, II, 207, 234; *Ālamgīr Nāma*, 1062.
- 255 *Ādāb-i-Ālamgīrī*, 107b.
- 256 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 73.
- 257 Tavernier, I, 391.
- 258 *English Factories*, XII, 284.
- 259 *Sikh Religion*, V, 301.
- 260 *Khulasat-ut-Tawārīkh*, 13.
- 261 *Sikh Religion*, V, 305.
- 262 Bakht Mall tells us that the emperor called the guru to the court because he heard of his miracles, 14b.
- 263 *Tārīkh-i-Sikhān*, 146.
- 264 *Sikh Religion*, V, 309.
- 265 Ramzan, 17.
- 266 Bakht Mall, 15b.
- 267 *ibid.*, 16a.
- 268 *ibid.*, 15a.
- 269 *Khulasat-ut-Tawārīkh*, 70.
- 270 Bakht Mall, 17a.
- 271 Quoted in the *Later Mughals*, 74n.
- 272 Bakht Mall, 17a; *Vichitra Nātāk*, Ch. V. Cf. Trump, 708.
- 273 *News Letter*, 20 November 1693. Another *News Letter* (16 April 1699) refers to the report

- brought by the imperial messengers who had been sent to the *fojdār* of Sirhind with instructions to admonish Gobind, son of Togh Bahādur.
- 274 *Ahkām-i-‘Ālamgīrī*, 15a.
 275 *Māāsīr-i-‘Ālamgīrī*, 153.
 276 *Kalīmāt-i-Tayyibāt*, 115.
 277 *Inshā-i Mādhorām*, 83.
- 278 *Ahkām-i-‘Ālamgīrī*, 55b, 56a.
 279 *Vichitra Nālak*, Ch. XII.
 280 *Ahkām-i-‘Ālamgīrī*, 2a.
 281 *Kalīmāt*, 2a, Khāfi Khān, II, 651-2, speaks of Aurangzeb's orders for the desecration of Sikh temples and their expulsion from his territories.

Appendix I

LIST OF MANSABDARS

Commanders of 7,000

- 1 Raja Jai Singh of Jaipur.
- 2 Maharaja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur.
- 3 Raja Sāhu, Shivājī's grandson and a ward of the emperor.

Commanders of 6,000

- 4 Maharana Rāj Singh of Mewar.
- 5 Kanhāji
- 6 Salvad Dafalya
- 7 Santāji Jādūn.

} Marathas.

Commanders of 5,000

- 8 Sambhāji (only for a short period).
- 9 Netaji, Shivājī's commander-in-chief. After Shivājī's escape from Agra he was imprisoned. He sought freedom by becoming a Muslim. It is interesting to note that his status was then reduced to a commander of 3,500, as he had ceased to be Shivājī's commander-in-chief.

- 10 Bijāji.
- 11 Pratāp.
- 12 Raja Bhīm Singh of Banera.
- 13 Raja Jai Singh of Toda.
- 14 Raja Rām Singh of Jaipur.
- 15 Achalāji Nimbalkar.
- 16 Maharana Jai Singh of Udaipur.
- 17 Maharana Amar Singh II of Udaipur.

- 18 Priya Nāyak of Sakhar; (Deccan).
- 19 Bālāji.
- 20 Janoji.
- 21 Nakoji Munja.
- 22 Sobhānji.
- 23 Barnā Rāo.

Commanders of 4,000

- 21 Raja Chhatra Sūl Bundela.
- 25 Jaswant Rāo.
- 26 Tarsoji.
- 27 Bābhāji, son of Dafalya.
- 28 Siyāji.
- 29 Jādun Rāi.
- 30 Rāmāji.
- 31 Raja Indra Man of Dhandlora.
- 32 Raja Bishon Singh of Jaipur.
- 33 Raja Rāi Singh Rāthor.
- 34 Rambhāji.

Commanders of 3,500

- 35 Raja Rājrup of Nurpur (Punjab).
- 36 Raja Indar Singh.
- 37 Udai Singh Bundela.
- 38 Raja Anurudh Gaur.
- 39 Raja Anup Singh.

Commanders of 3,000

- 40 Rao Mān Singh of Kishan Garh.
- 41 Raja Sujūn Singh Bundela.
- 42 Rao Dalpat Bundela.
- 43 Raja Raghunāth. (Imperial finance minister.)
- 44 Rao Bhāo Singh Hāda.

- 45 Viram Dev Sisodia.
- 46 Durgū Dās Rathor (for a short period only)
- 47 Raja Kirat Singh Kachwaha
- 48 Gardhar Dās Gaur.
- 49 Rao Karn Bhūrtya of Bikaner.
- 50 Udāji Rām.
- 51 Jākoji.
- 52 Parsoji Bhonsla. He was a commander of 3,000 under Shāh Jahān. In Aurangzeb's reign he had a salary of Rs20,000 a year.
- 53 Vasudev Singh.
- 54 Rao Dalip Singh of Urehha.
- 55 Sundarji.
- 56 Indar Singh.
- 57 Himmat Rāo Kōli.
- 58 Bājī Rāo.
- 59 Sarūp Singh.
- 60 Badarji.

Commanders of 2,500

- 61 Rao Shubh Karn.
- 62 Raja Devī Singh Bundela of Urehha.
- 63 Raja Bhagvant Singh Bundela.
- 64 Amar Singh Chandrāvāt.
- 65 Kishan Singh of Jaipur.
- 66 Māyājī.
- 67 Raja Rām Singh of Kota.
- 68 Raja Anūp Singh Bhūrtya.
- 69 Rustam Rāo.
- 70 Khindoji.
- 71 Butoji.

Commanders of 2,000

- 72 Raja Rāj Singh II of Jaipur.
- 73 Raja Todar Mall, Revenue Department.
- 74 Raja Vikram Singh of Guler (Punjab).
- 75 Pritam Singh Rāthor.

- 76 Udyat Singh Bhadorya.
- 77 Rām Chand.
- 78 Rām Singh Hādū.
- 79 Medni Singh of Semagar (Garhwal).
- 80 Arjoji.
- 81 Mankoji.
- 82 Mādho Nārān
- 83 Vyās Rāo.
- 84 Tānājī.
- 85 Raja Jagat Singh Hādū.
- 86 Am Rāi, Diwan i-Tan.
- 87 Bahādur Singh
- 88 Bhūpat Singh.
- 89 Rām Singh (son of Rattan Singh Rathor).
- 90 Rām Chandra.
- 91 Auji Abalrao (?).
- 92 Nimūji Sindhyā.

Commanders of 1,500

- 93 Amar Singh Sasodia (Rampur).
- 94 Raja Sabal Singh Sasodia.
- 95 Bhojrāj Kachwāhā.
- 96 Mān Singh (Gwalior).
- 97 Raja Prithi Chand.
- 98 Raja Sārāndhar of Jumoun.
- 99 Shiv Singh.
- 100 Chaturbhuj Chauhān.
- 101 Amar Singh of Narwar.
- 102 Raghunāth Singh Rathor.
- 103 Udai Singh Mertā.
- 104 Bīr Singh (Chamba).
- 105 Mahesh Dās Rāthor.
- 106 Raja Sarūp Singh.
- 107 Manohar Dās.
- 108 Ajit Singh Rāthor.
- 109 Raghunāth Singh Bhūrtya.
- 110 Rai Makrand.
- 111 Raja Indar Man Bundela.
- 112 Trimbakji Bhonsla.
- 113 Bagoji.
- 114 Rambhaji.
- 115 Raja Sarup Singh (Bikaner).

116 Raja Mohkam Singh Sasodia.

117 Bhagwant Singh.

Commanders of 1,000

118 Jagrām.

119 Raja Mahā Singh Bhadorya.

120 Raja Kishan Singh (Chaudrāwat of Tomar.

121 Raja Chatar Singh of Chamba (Punjab).

122 Raja Kalyān Singh of Bandhu.

123 Raghunāth Sasodia.

124 Vijya Singh.

125 Māhojī.

126 Prahlādji.

127 Parsoji.

128 Tānāji (?).

129 Sujān Rāo.

130 Raja Udai Singh (Chamba, Punjab).

131 Rām Chand (son of Dalpat Bundela).

132 Dandkat Rāo.

133 Rāwal Jaswant Singh (Dungarpur).

134 Gumān Singh.

135 Sūr Singh.

136 Shiv Singh.

137 Sabra Nāl.

138 Sambhāji (?).

139 Ratan Rāo.

140 Sarūp Singh (son of Udyot Singh).

141 Mitra Sen Bundela.

142 Bhīm Singh (Srinagar, Garhwal).

143 Māndhātā (son of Raja Rājūrūp of Nurpur).

144 Bhawāni Dās Bhūrtiya.

145 Sher Singh (son of Rām Singh Rāthor).

146 Sūraj Mall Gaur.

147 Harjas Gaur.

148 Gopāl Singh Kachhwāhā.

149 Arjan Gaur.

150 Sūraj Mall (son of Raja Bhīm Singh).

151 Dal Singh Sasodia.

152 Arjun Singh.

153 Chatroji.

154 Raja Rām Dās Narwarī.

155 Rawal Rām Singh (Dungarpur).

156 Badan Singh Bhadorya.

157 Narsingh Rāo.

158 Bahādur Singh.

159 Ratan Rāo.

160 Sarsā.

Appendix II

HINDU CONVERTS TO ISLAM

Hari Rām Bhagat who had been converted to Islam in December, 1666, was given a daily allowance of 4 annas only.

The next set of converts fared better. Surat Singh, Rām Dās, Makar Kishor, and Chohān Rupā were given dresses of honour on 16 February 1667; as also was Murāri, a Khatri by caste, on 4 May 1667.

It seems to have soon become bruited abroad that conversion to Islam was a sure method for covering all sins of omission and commission.

On 4 May 1667, a qānūngo, Parmānand, similarly embraced Islam and was thereupon honoured with the gift of robes of honour. On the same day, Mohan Dās Khatri was also honoured on his conversion.

On 5 September 1669 Pars Rām and four others were reported to have been converted to Islam.

On 26 January 1670 one Gopī Nāth was converted to Islam, given a daily allowance of Rs7 and named 'Āqil Muhammad.

On 14 January 1671 two Hindu converts to Islam were presented to the emperor who honoured them by bestowing robes of honour on them.

One Gangā Rām, who had recently accepted Islam, was similarly honoured on 31 August 1674.

On 19 October 1681, Tolā Rām, a qānūngo of Bengal, was restored to his office and given robes of honour on his conversion to Islam. The other converts of the year were Jairām (3 November 1689); Gaj Singh (10 October 1692); Muhammad Hayāt (23 October 1692); Shaikh 'Abdulla

(8 December 1692); Chand Bhān (10 January 1693); Nūrullah (11 January 1693); and Sarvan Singh (16 April 1693).

On 17 April 1693 a Hindu convict was let off on his being converted to Islam.

Nanhu was given a dress of honour on 23 October 1693; Achuā on 6 November; Gangā Rām on 21 November; Jiwan, a blacksmith, Sāhib Rāi and Bhāg Rām on 3 December.

In the *News Letters* of the year 1694, many converts have been mentioned: Sulaimān, Jairām, Sūrat Singh, Chatar Singh, Shankārjī and Hem Rāj Jādun, Rānjī, Bāliajī, Muttājī, Harilājī, Udairāo, Bhikam, Gangā Rām, Rām Rāi, Hirā and Mān Singh.

Dayānt Rāi, an erstwhile qānūngo of Sialkot, who had been dismissed some time earlier, joined the ranks of the true believers and was therefore reinstated to his former position on 7 June 1695.

The following conversions are mentioned in the *News Letters* of dates given against each name :—

Gujar Mall and Rām Singh (5 June 1695).

Ghāsi Rām and Bhikam Dās (23 May 1695).

Manshā Rām (13 March 1696).

Khāndai Rāo and Jagan Nāth were made prisoners during the course of an imperial expedition into the Deccan. They were converted on 27 May 1700.

Several converts are mentioned in the *News Letters* for the year 1702. On 28 February, one Ghulām Muhammed; on 9 March, Ballu; on 12 June, Nar Nārāyan; on 17 November, a Marāṭha desmukh and a Hindu chaudhri and on 18 November, one Dīn Dār.

The *News Letters* for the province of Gujarat speak of the conversion of several Hindus there in the years 46 and 47 of the reign.

The year 1703 yields many cases of conversions. Jodh Chand's conversion is assigned to 22 March 1703. Nām Dev, another convert from Hinduism, was appointed to the command of 400 on 2 May 1704; Daulatmand Khān on 7 May. On 10 May 1703 an unsuccessful attempt seems to have been made to convert Raja Sāhu, Shivāji's grandson, who refused. Aurangzeb then gave orders to Hamīd-ud-dīn to continue trying and to seize the first favourable opportunity. On 14 May, however, Kesari Singh was converted. The office of qānūngo seems to have provided another convert on 26 June, when Bhīm Rāj, a former qānūngo of Sialkot, was converted. On 4 September Jawalā Nāth was admitted to the fold; two days later, Jot Nāth and others were converted. On the 15 September Muhammad Rashīd, a new convert, is reported to have made his appearance in the imperial court. In the month of November, several such cases were reported. Shiv Singh, a grandson of Raja Kishan Dāss of Amroha, was converted and reappointed as the Musharaf of Imtiaz Garh on 10 September. Shaikh Ghulām Muhammad, a new convert, figures in the *News Letter* of 9 November and Shambhu Nāth, a deshmukh who was in prison got its doors opened by conversion to Islam and was restored to his former office on 22 November. Shaikh Husain figures in the *News Letter* of 30 November. In the month of December many more cases were brought before the emperor. On 9 December, Mahammad Wajih, who had once been Karam Singh, paid his respects to the emperor in the open court. On 25 December, Sa'adat Mand, son of Rāi Baikunth, an official in the revenue department, was honoured by an imperial audience. Malūk Chand was admitted to the court on 29 December.

Maratha prisoners provided two more converts this year. After the death of Raja Rām some members of his family had fallen into the hands of the Mughals. On 24 January

1704 a daughter of Raja Rām was married to Shamsheer Beg. On 5 March, a daughter of Sambhājī, who had probably been converted earlier to Islam after her father's execution, was married to Faqīr Muhammad.

Several mansabdārs of high ranks figure as converts from Hinduism. Nek Rām who rose to acquire the title of a raja is mentioned in the *News Letters* of 25 January 1704. Dalāwar, another convert, is spoken of as a commander of one thousand in the *News Letter* of 17 June 1704. Shankarjī, zamindar of Patudi, appears in the *News Letter* of an earlier date, 13 June.

As usual the ranks of the qānūngoes provide some more converts. Devī Chand, qanūngo of Sadhora, is mentioned as a convert on 3 February 1704, whereas Māyyā Rām, qānūngo of Shamsabad, makes his appearance as a convert towards the end of the year, on 10 December 1704.

Aurangzeb himself initiated into Islam Sāhib Rām and several others on 4 November, 1704. On 4 September 1704, Dinā Nāth, kotwāl of musketeers, was converted and given the Muslim name of Islām Yār.

Several other converts are mentioned in the *News Letter* of this year. Gajpat was converted on 7 February. He was given an elephant on 11 May. His sons seem to have soon followed his example and on 4 July, they figured as new converts in the court news. Shambhu Nāth's conversion is assigned to 14 February. In March, Bhūpat Rāi was converted and became known as Muhammad 'Alī. In May, Mirājī became Islām Ghālib and Khushhāl Chand was also converted. In the *News Letter* of 18 June, Yudhrāj's conversion is mentioned, whereas Dāl Kishan and Vīr Singh were converted on 16 October. Fath Ullah figures as a convert in the *News Letter* of 14 December. Yash Karn and a companion of his were converted on 26 March 1705.

On 26 November 1706, when operations against the Jats were brought to a successful termination, Fath Singh, son of Raja Rām, was converted.

Original authorities other than the *News Letters*, also mention several other cases as well which may well be now detailed.

Lūn Karn was converted in the year 1705-1706 and given the name of 'Abdul Latīf.¹

A correspondent of Aurangzeb, to prove his zeal, reported that he had persuaded a Hindu to accept the true faith and probably sought imperial permission for the purpose of bringing him to the court. Aurangzeb wrote to him replying that the best thing was to convert him where he was. But if that was difficult, he might take him to the court of the provincial governor and convert him there. In any case Aurangzeb counselled expedition.²

Indar Singh, qānūngo of Rasūlpur, petitioned the emperor and said he was willing to be converted. The emperor, thereupon, ordered that he be granted the larger share in the proceeds of the rights of a qānūngo.³

The Raja of Palanau was offered better terms if he would accept Islam.⁴

Sobhā Shankar Bhadorya became a convert and was given a suitable gift.⁵ A Deccanese was converted to Islam and was given Rs2,000.⁶

Bishan Nārāin, son of Raja Shiv Nārāyan of Kuch Bihar, was admitted into the true faith while Aurangzeb's armies were busy in an expedition against his father.⁷

In the tenth year of Aurangzeb's reign Kondājī, uncle of Netojī, was also converted.⁸

A son of Gokal Jāt was converted to Islam after his father's death and he became one of the most famous reciters of the Qur'ān of his days.⁹

A daughter of Amar Singh, Chief of Manoharpur, was, after being initiated into the Muslim faith, married to prince Kām Bakhsh on 28 July 1682.¹⁰

A daughter of the Raja of Apsas was married to Muhammad A'zam in the eleventh year. She also had been converted first.¹¹

Raja Kishan Singh and his son quarrelled. The son promised to become a Muslim if upheld against his father. He became a Muslim and later on turned a traitor to the Muslims.¹²

The Rāiazāda of Rajauri became a Muslim and was named Lufullah.¹³ Udai Rāj, a clerk of Raja Jai Singh, was converted to Islam and nicknamed Tālih Yār.¹⁴

NOTES

1 *Kār-nāma-i-Jethmall*, 168.

2 *Kalimāt-i-Tayyibāt*, Letter No. 381.

3 *Ahkām-i-Ālamgīrī*, 227a.

4 *Ālamgīr Nāma*, 655.

5 *ibid.*, 567.

6 *ibid.*, 567.

7 *ibid.*, 648.

8 *Ālamgīr Nāma*, 1062.

9 *Maāsir-i-Ālamgīrī*, 94.

10 *ibid.*, 211.

11 *ibid.*, 73.

12 Manucci, III, 194.

13 *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*, 143.

14 *Haft Anjuman*, f. 1a.

Appendix III

AURANGZEB AND THE SIKHS

After some time the Muslims arrested Guru Arjun as a Kāfir. His head and feet were put into a press and he was then thrown into the river. He disappeared and was never seen again. He died on 4th Jaith, bright half, Friday, and was venerated as a guru for twenty-four years and nine months.

After Guru Arjun, his son, Hargōvind, became his successor. In order to avenge himself for his father's execution he decided always to wear arms, and equipped himself with two swords. On his becoming a guru his followers became very piously inclined towards him. Who-soever became his disciple brought horses and arms as an offering. His followers also began wearing arms.

Quarrels soon arose between the Udāsīs and the Muslims. Someone asked the guru, 'Why do you wear two swords?' He answered, 'One is for avenging my father's death on the Muslims, the other for continuing the miracle-working power of the saints and prophets'. His wife was named Nānakī. Bābā Gurditta, Tegh Bahādur, Ani Rāi, Atul Rāi and Sūrat Singh were his children. Ani Rāi and Atul Rāi died childless. Sūrat Singh and Tegh Bahādur took refuge in the northern mountains during the lifetime of their father, being driven there by their enemies. Bābā Gurditta left two children, Dhīraj Mall and Har Rāi. Hargōvind remained the guru for thirty-one years, six months and two days. He died on 10 Chait, bright half, 1695 A.V.

After Hargōvind, his grandson Har Rāi sat on the throne of Khilāfat. He lived independently. He had a wife

from a good family Tarbenī by name. She gave birth to a son who was called Har Kishan. Another son was called Rām Rāi. When Aurangzeb heard of the guru's miracles, he summoned him to his presence. It is said that the guru excused himself and sent Rām Rāi. He told him not to disclose the secret of his powers. When Rām Rāi came before Aurangzeb, he gave him a seat on a well which had been covered over and looked like a solid floor. There was water underneath. He was not however injured. Aurangzeb was taken aback by this and gave him a livable place in which to stay. It is said that in order to test him, the Sultan sent a sheep for him to eat. He took it and sent a quarter to the spiritual guide of the Sultan. Another day the Sultan asked for the sheep. Rām Rāi had not thrown away the skin and the bones of the sheep. He prayed for its life. The sheep rose on its three legs. The Sultan asked him where the fourth leg was. He answered, 'In the stomach of your spiritual guide'. When the Sultan recognized his power of working miracles, he sent him away and gave him a jāgir in the plateau of the Srinagar (Garhwal) mountains. Though the guru withdrew his blessing from this group, his abode has today become the place of worship of all. As he had disclosed his power of working miracles to the Sultan and disregarded the advice of his father, Bhāi Kalyānā and Bhāi Gurdāsā, who had accompanied him by his father's order to see that he did not leave the straight path, realized they had no influence over him and were not respected. Both of them left him and came to the guru. They told him their story. He honoured both of them. Having placed his younger son, Har Kishan, on the honoured seat he died on Saturday, 9th Kartik, dark-half, 1710 A.V.

In Makhawal Guru Har Rāi's son, Har Kishan, who was only six years old became his successor. It is said that he also was called to court by Aurangzeb. The guru said, 'I will not see the face of a Muslim'. His disciples seated

him in a palanquin and brought him to Delhi, so that he might live there. When the rumour of his arrival in Delhi spread, some persons took the news to a khatri who was closely allied to the family of the guru. He said that the guru was yet a minor and therefore had no reason to come to Delhi. He further declared that if it was true, the guru would himself come to his house. While this discussion was going on, the guru's cavalcade reached his house. With all honours, he was taken into the house and served well. On Friday, 4th Chait, bright-half, 1712, the young guru died of smallpox. He had not looked on the face of a Muslim. While he lay dying, his disciples asked him whom they should declare as his successor as he left no one of his own stock. He said, 'Take the Bābā of Bakala', and died. He had been guru for 2 years 5 months and 19 days.

His disciples who had been set a riddle by the guru about his successor began to search for him. The village of Bakala was near the Bari Doab and included many sons of the race of the guru. They began to ask each other: 'The guru appointed the Bābā of Bakala as his successor. There are many Bābās here. Whom shall we elect as our guru?' One of them said, 'I have vowed Rs500 to the guru. Whosoever among these descendants of the guru would demand this sum of me would be the person fitted to adorn the seat of the guru'. All agreed to this form of making a decision and a day was fixed. All the descendants of the guru were summoned and offerings were made to them. When the turn of the man who had made the vow came to make his offerings, Guru Tegh Bahādur who was present among those receiving the offerings, caught hold of his hand and demanded to know why after promising a larger amount he was paying less. The disciple thereupon called all his fellow disciples together and told them he had discovered the man for whom they had been looking. Here was the Bābā of Bakala. He paid

Guru Tegh Bahādur the promised amount and with the consent of all seated him on the seat of the guru.

Now that Guru Tegh Bahadur had come to power, his faithful disciples came to his help and increased his influence. He lived a hard life. He was, however, very independent. Whatever his disciples brought to him, he distributed and kept nothing for himself. His wife's name was Gajari and his dear son was called Gobind Singh. In a short time he acquired mastery over all his subjects. When Aurangzeb heard about the guru, he summoned him to Delhi from Lahore. He was brought to Delhi. He did not mind the troubles he encountered on the way and travelled with an easy mind. When he reached Delhi, his disciples came and gave him valuable offerings. The guru did not accept anything. When the sultan heard of this he was upset and requested him to perform a miracle. The guru said, 'Miracle is the head of the lovers. Place the sword on my neck'. The emperor was angry at these words and ordered his execution. The Sikhs say that the executioner felt himself almost incapable of touching the head of the guru. Before he died the guru requested a Sikh who was in attendance to carry away his head after his execution.

A liberty loving faqir happened to pass where the corpse of the guru lay and said, 'The sultan has not done well. Such things will lead to great rebellion, and Delhi will become entirely desolated'. The Sikhs brought the guru's head to Anandpur and kept it. The body was cremated at Rikāb Gunj. The places of execution, of cremation, and the burial of the head have become places of pilgrimage for the Sikhs. This happened in 1732 A.V. in the month of Maghar, the fifth day of the bright-half.

(Translated from Bakht Mall's *History of the Sikhs*.)

Chapter VI

NATURE OF THE STATE IN MUGHAL INDIA

In the dust of controversy raised over the religious policy of the Mughal emperors in India, the nature of the Mughal state has become very much clouded. Sometimes it is described as an 'oriental despotism', sometimes as a theocracy. Some have even gone to the length of claiming a divine origin for it, others have invested its kings with Divine Rights. Unfortunately most of these conclusions have been arrived at without a critical examination of the original materials now at our disposal regarding the state in Mughal India. The theories of the early Arab jurists, the practices of Muslim kings elsewhere, and the verbose discussions of writers outside India, though certainly useful in giving us a background, do not help us much in understanding the exact nature of the Mughal state in India.

Let us, first of all, clear the ground by examining the 'Divine' claims made on behalf of some of the Mughal kings by contemporary chroniclers and modern writers. Akbar and his successors are very often described as the Caliphs (agents) of God by contemporary writers, particularly by official historians of the Mughals. Jahāngīr himself claims a divine sanction for his being the ruler of India when Khusrau, his son, rebelled.² Shāh Jahān described himself as 'the shadow of God' in one of his letters to 'Adil Khan' of Golkandā.³ Aurāngzeb speaks of himself as a 'vakīl' (agent) of God on earth.⁴ On the surface these claims seem to support the theory of the Divine Right of the Mughal kings. But, examined closely, they do not amount to much more than a mere assertion of the usual Muslim belief

that whatever happens in this world is ordained by God. They do not claim for the Mughal emperors any status higher than that of mere men. Nor were they intended to confer on those who made these claims either a sacerdotal office or status. The emperors did not acquire a privileged position thereby, as many contemporary European kings did by becoming 'the Lord's anointed' at their coronation. The difference between the Mughal concept and the contemporary ideas of the Divine Right of Kings in the West can be best understood by examining the history of England in the seventeenth century. When James I claimed a Divine Right for the royal office, it produced the religious doctrine of non-resistance and passive obedience to the King. To rebel became not only a crime punishable by the state but a sin bringing about damnation in the next world. It led to the curious emergence of the non-jurors after the English Revolution. They counted among them, some of the foremost churchmen of the time. They held that James II 'across the Seas' was their only lawful sovereign even though some of them had joined together in inviting William from Holland in order to put an end to James II's attempt at catholicizing England. Such a concept of the royal office was foreign to the Mughal period in India. No qāzī condemned Salīm when he rebelled against his father, nor did any theologian damn Khurram with 'bell, book and candle' when he rose against Jahāngīr. It is true on Aurangzeb's accession, his *sadr-us-sadūr* refused to read the Khutba in his name and thus proclaim him the emperor, because his father Shāh Jahān was still alive.⁵ But this did not imply any 'divinity hedging round the (Mughal) crown'. During Akbar's reign, when his half brother, Hākīm, invaded India, Akbar had no 'divine protection' to display against him and had to depend on his military strength to make good his claim to Bābur's empire. Thus whenever 'divinity' is dragged in either as an attribute

of the royal power or the source of imperial authority, it is more or less a trick of the trade, a play upon words, or a mere assertion that, like everything else, royalty must trace its origin to Divine dispensation.

This brings us to the second aspect of our problem. How far and in what sense was the Mughal Government an Oriental despotism? That in itself raises the question of the significance of Oriental despotism. That there was any special variety of despotic rule manufactured in the East, and presumably on that account more despotic than the variety cultured in the West, is open to serious doubt. In this form of government there is neither East nor West. If Louis XIV could claim in France that he was the state, an Aurangzeb could go no higher and sometimes not even as high as that.

Despotic the Mughal emperors certainly were. There were no popular institutions acting as checks on them. But we shall get a wrong idea about the extent of their power, if we took this to mean that they had the right or the authority to issue commands concerning the entire life of their subjects or even concerning all their political activities. They were never recognized as 'the masters of the Law', though they had to concede very often that they were its servants. The entire field of the personal law of their subjects was covered by the Hindu and the Muslim law which, the emperors admitted, they had no authority to change. The only known invasion of Hindu law occurred under Shāh Jahān when, as already related, Shāh Jahān took measures to secure that family pressure should not prevent a Hindu from being admitted to Islam.⁶ This might possibly have involved a change in the Hindu law of property whereby an apostate was given a share in the family estate contrary to Hindu law. No change in the personal law of the Muslims seems to have been either attempted or carried out.

This explains the curious observation of some European travellers who declared that the Mughals possessed no written law.⁷ The law was certainly written, but the Mughal state had had no hand in the making thereof. No Mughal laws could be discovered because none such had been made. But of written laws there was such a multiplicity that Aurangzeb was driven to codify them—not by his authority as the Mughal emperor, but as a serious student of Muslim law, who felt that it was very difficult to find one's way in the intricacies of the Muslim law as it then stood.⁸ The *Fatāwa 'Ālamgīrī* that resulted from the labours of the theologians he employed owed nothing of its authority by being called after him; its compilers had to cite authority for every view they advanced or adopted.

Of course several Sanskrit digests of Hindu personal law were prepared during the period. Again they owed nothing of their authority to the emperors. Kamalakar, Raghunandan, Mitramisra, Narasingha and a host of minor writers laboured hard in the various branches of the Hindu law, deriving their opinions from ancient law-givers or sometimes striking out new paths for themselves in order to get out of the confused growth of the multiplicity of opinion expressed by their predecessors. The Hindus were in a further position of advantage in this respect. They had courts of their own—the panchayats—for deciding cases turning on the interpretation of their personal law. It is very difficult to discover any imperial attempt at modifying either the composition of these courts or their law of procedure during this period.

The criminal law was again Muslim. The relation between the subjects themselves as also between the state and its subjects were fundamentally governed by the Muslim law. We have seen that Akbar made serious changes when he changed the religious policy of the state. His modifications, however, really concerned the field of public law. Even

here they usually involved a declaration by the state that it would not prosecute offenders—mostly non-Muslims—against certain laws. Sometimes this was extended to include the cessation of prosecution of the Muslims for what can only be termed as religious offences—their non-fulfilment of their religious duties.⁹ One must admit, that the Mughal emperors exercised a good deal of authority here. Akbar was not, however, an innovator herein as he is sometimes supposed to be. Before him, 'Alā-ud-Dīn and Muhammad Tughlaq had started on paths of their own.¹⁰ As we have already seen, the so-called Infallibility Decree was mainly a concession to orthodoxy rather than a valid instrument for changing the Muslim Law.¹¹ Unlike 'Alā-ud-Dīn who declared that he did not know the law and acted on his intuition, Akbar still professed to act within the law, adopting one of the so many prevailing opinions among the canon law jurists. Strictly speaking then, even Akbar did not claim the right of changing the Muslim public law in theory though he changed it in practice by his disuse of some of its provisions.

Under Aurangzeb this right to modify the Muslim law was surrendered. Time and again we find him not only consulting the theologians with regard to matters of civil or criminal law, we find him extending his submission to it even in matters of taxation and regulation of trade and commerce. He broke the monopoly enjoyed by the manufacturers of wire at Ahmedabad and threw the trade open to all after consultation with his theologians.¹² He gave up his attempt to regulate prices when he discovered that it was unlawful.¹³ He even allowed his pet project of making converts to be endangered by remitting a case of murder to the qāzī rather than absolve the murderer when he offered to embrace Islam.¹⁴ His reign was the Golden Age of mullādom and he accepted this check on his authority gladly.¹⁵

That brings us to the question of the alleged theocratic nature of the Mughal state! Whatever might have been involved in the practices of early Muslim rulers, under the Mughals the state could not be called a theocracy. This form of government involves the subordination of the state to the church. Now, Islam did not set up an organized church, nor did it recognize the custom of priests specially ordained for their office. It had no hierarchy of religious officials enjoying primarily a religious status. A theocracy in the ordinary sense of the term would have been impossible under Muslim rule when no one at any time possessed the right of rendering infallible interpretations of the Muslim law. Of course the Muslims did have a Khalifa, sometimes more than one of them. But the Khalifa was not a spiritual ruler in the sense in which the Pope is. He possessed no power of issuing *ex cathedra* interpretations of Islam legally binding on all Muslims. The Qur'ān interpreted in the light of the early traditions of the life of the Prophet or his companions was—and still is—the only lawful religious authority recognized in Islam. Change had been permitted by the provision that whatever was sanctioned by the entire Muslim world was lawful.¹⁶

If this was the general position, it was much more so in India and particularly in Mughal India. The Muslim personal law here did not extend to the preponderant part of the Indian population. It is impossible to think of a state as a theocracy where such a large part of the population was admittedly left to its own devices in matters of such great importance. Even Aurangzeb made no attempt at introducing any changes here.

But there was one matter in which the Mughal state came dangerously near to recognizing the authority of an ecclesiastical dignitary. The *sadr-us-sadūr* was the chief theologian in the state, presumably the most learned doctor of the law, and its most pious practitioner. All the Mughal

emperors agreed in leaving to their *sadr* the authority to declare the Muslim law. Akbar alone claimed for himself, as a righteous ruler, the power to adopt one of the many conflicting views on a matter under the Infallibility Decree. But even this did not profit him much until a change was made in the holder of the office. It was necessary for him even after this declaration to dismiss Abdun Nabī and install *Sadr-i-Jahān* as his *sadr-us-sadūr*. The declaration itself had been made only when the *sadr-us-sadūr* had signed it. Thus here was a curious situation. The *sadr-us-sadūr* had the right of declaring the law when in office. But the emperors appointed the *sadrs* and could dismiss any incumbent. Thus while in office the *sadr-us-sadūr* was independent of the emperor who could however dismiss him from office. This was well illustrated in connexion with Aurangzeb's accession. His *sadr-us-sadūr* refused to legalise his accession because his father was still alive. Aurangzeb got out of it by dismissing the *sadr-us-sadūr* and finding a convenient successor who declared in advance that the *Khutba* could be read in Aurangzeb's name in his father's lifetime because his father was incapacitated from acting¹⁷—presumably because he had been imprisoned by his son. Thus it was necessary for the Mughal emperors to be sure of securing a theologian learned enough to be raised to the position of the *sadr-us-sadūr* if necessary, in order to justify their conduct. Under Aurangzeb the subservient position of the emperor with regard to the law was recognized in a very interesting manner. *Vukla-i-Shara'* were appointed to enable his subjects to sue him and get justice done according to the law.¹⁸ This only enabled the launching of what we call Petitions of Right in English constitutional law for the redress of private wrongs. It had nothing to do with Aurangzeb's administrative policy. It gave no one any right to control the political institutions of the country.

But if the Mughal empire was not a theocracy, the Mughal emperors in several ways undertook to act as the agents of Islam. In theory they were nothing more than that—above all in the case of Aurangzeb. Akbar took a pride in his conquests as a means of making ordinances of Islam known far and wide and spreading the authority of the Prophet to territories where even his name had not been heard of before.¹⁹ Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān considered themselves the guardians of the true faith and watched over its legitimate interests.²⁰ Aurangzeb's supreme ambition was to promote the Muslim way of life not only among the Muslims but, at least in outward conduct, among the non-Muslims as well.²¹ Though even he was compelled to make a concession in favour of the Christians by allowing them to drink.²²

But Muslim political theories, depending not mainly upon the Qur'ān but partly on the practices of the later Muslim kings and partly on the traditions of the Persian non-Muslim rulers, were not easily applicable to India. Was India a Dār-ul-Islām, the home of the faithful or Dār-ul-Harb, a target for Muslim attacks? Even in such a simple matter it was impossible even for an Aurangzeb to apply Muslim traditions of the law which had arisen elsewhere, to Indian conditions. Still earlier Muslim kings in India had sometimes presumed to act beyond the strict letter of the Muslim law. Early in India's contact with Islam, it seems to have been realized that it was impossible to dream of her accepting Islam wholesale. The matter was left there and with it came several modifications in Muslim law and practice in India. Naturally this destroyed the theory that the Muslim rulers in India were to rule here entirely as the agents of Islam.

To revert to the nature of the Mughal state then, it was a despotism of a limited nature where the rulers generally claimed to act as the agents of Islam the exact demands of

which they felt themselves free to decide. It was a despotism that left a very wide margin to its citizens' choice, in theory as well as in practice.

It is necessary however to remember one very important factor. Limited though the authority of the Mughal emperor was in certain ways, if they decided to overstep those limits there was nothing in the political institutions of the state to serve as an effective check on them. But popular rebellion was always there as a well-recognized method of expressing disapproval of a ruler's policy. It did not carry with it the same religious taint as it did in contemporary England for example. Still further, hereditary monarchy, as such, was unknown to the early Muslim law or practice though the Shi'a schism was based on an assertion of such claims. The early Muslim ruler—the Khalifa—was an elect of the faithful. Neither the Qur'ān nor the Tradition, except among the Shi'as, recognized the principle of hereditary succession, so much so that there is no recognized law of succession for the state. The personal claim to the state was not recognized, it was not property in the legal sense of the term. Naturally no law of inheritance, as such, was necessary or valid. Earlier Muslim kings in India got out of this difficulty by denying in theory their sovereign position. They held power and exercised authority not in their own right but as officers appointed by some far distant Muslim ruler who claimed to be the Khalifa.²³ Bābur and his successors refused to cling to that useless fiction particularly because they, themselves, were the greatest Muslim rulers in the world at that time. But even the allegiance to the Khalifa, though useful sometimes as a convenient fiction to support an existing ruler, failed to provide any valid rule of succession. Where law failed the monarchy, practice proved of no better help. The deathbed of almost every Mughal emperor witnessed a feverish activity to settle the question of succession. While Bābur lay dying,

his Prime Minister was busy conspiring to keep out Humāyūn.²⁴ Humāyūn's death was too sudden and the Mughal position in India too precarious at that time to admit of much disputing about succession. Akbar's death was followed by Jahāngīr's accession; but Khusrāu, Jahāngīr's eldest son, contested his own father's right to succeed. The latter part of Jahāngīr's reign was disfigured by conspiracies of various types regarding the succession. After his death the unfortunate Bulāqī was chosen to keep his place warm for Shāh Jahān who was absent in the south. Shāh Jahān's arrival saw Bulāqī murdered and Shāh Jahān sat on his father's throne after wading through the blood of his possible rivals. Aurangzeb paid him back by imprisoning him and ruling, not in Shāh Jahān's name, but in his own, even while Shāh Jahān was alive. Thus the Mughal practice adhered closely to the contemporary Muslim notions about succession to the state. It was not successful rebellion resulting in violently upsetting any recognized law or practice that was responsible for these incidents. It seemed to be the normal course of things and was the result of absence of law on the subject.

It is also necessary to remember that the Mughal emperors left a very wide field of their citizens' activities alone. In Europe it was the period when political authorities—whether ruling princes or kings in Parliament—were busy dictating to their subjects even the variety of religious belief they were to hold. Those who governed on behalf of Edward VI, for example, said that the religion of the English people should be Protestant and England became Protestant. Mary came after him and, as if by magic, England reverted to Roman Catholicism. With Elizabeth the wheel turned again and England emerged Anglican from the struggle. Howsoever accustomed we might be at the present moment to the state's leaving the religion of its citizens alone—and even now, Hitler would not allow us

to take this as a matter of course—in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century the religious belief of their subjects was very much a concern of governments. The Mughals, therefore, proved an exception, when they left the religious beliefs of their subjects alone. They passed no Acts of Supremacy, they enforced no Thirty-Nine Articles, so far as the beliefs of the preponderant majority of the population were concerned. Even for the Muslims all that they did was to punish apostacy and extort outward conformity in certain matters of public conduct.

NOTES

- 1 *Akbar Nāma*, III, 97.
 - 2 *Tūzak*, 24.
 - 3 Lāhaurī, I, i, 174.
 - 4 *Nigār Namū Munshī*, 157.
 - 5 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 248; Tavernier, I, 356
 - 6 Lāhaurī, I, ii, 535, Qazvīnī, 401-5.
 - 7 Roe, 269.
 - 8 Cf. *Fatāwa-i-Ālamgīrī*.
 - 9 See Ch. 2.
 - 10 Barnī, 290, 338.
 - 11 See Ch. 2.
 - 12 *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 292-3.
 - 13 Khāfī Khān, II, 395.
 - 14 *Akhubārāt*, 10 May 1700.
 - 15 Aurangzeb renounced the practice of attaching the property of the public servants and realizing state dues by its sale because he was told it was against the Muslim Law (*Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 293).
- One of Aurangzeb's governors was so much upset by the privileged position occupied by the theologians at his court that on hearing of the report of Mughal difficulties in the south, he suggested that they be asked to use their spiritual powers. (Khāfī Khān, II, 343.)

A quarrel between the qāzī of Lahore and the governor of the Punjab about their status resulted in the qāzī's losing his life and the governor's losing his office. (Khāfī Khān, II, 257-8).

For further instances of the powers and privileges of the theologians, cf. Kazim 1075-76; *Jaipur Records*, VI, 260-1. *Akhabārāt* (Provincial series, Gujarat), year 46, 22; Khāfī Khān, II, 444-5.

- 16 *Mohammedanism* by C. S. Plurgenje, 66, 73.
- 17 Tavernier, I, 356. *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadī*, I, 248.
- 18 A Wakīl-i-Sharh' holding the rank of a dōsd panjahi (over 250) is mentioned in the *Akhabārāt* dated 17 January 1703.
- 19 *Letters of Abu'l Fazl*, part I, Letter No. 3.
- 20 See Chs. III and IV.
- 21 See Ch. V.
- 22 *Inshā-i-Mādho Rām*, 59.
- 23 Cf. Tripaṭhī, *Some Aspects of Muslim Rule in India*.
- 24 *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, 193.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORITIES

Arabic

1. Mu'alim-ul-Qurba, by Muhammad, ed. Levy with an English abstract.
2. *Fatawa-i-'Ālamgīrī*, Urdu translation. (The Nawal Kishore Press, Lucknow.)

Persian

MANUSCRIPTS

1. Amīn Ahmad Rāzī : *Haft Aqālīm*.
2. Zāin Khān : *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī*.
3. 'Abdullah : *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*.
4. 'Abbās : *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī*.
5. Ahmed Yādgār : *Tārīkh-i-Sulātīn Afāghāna*. (Since printed.)
6. 'Arif Qandahārī : *Tārīkh-i-Muhammad*.
7. *Tārīkh-i-Bāyazīd*.
8. *Travels of 'Abdul Latīf from Gujarat to Bengal during the years 1607 and 1608*.
9. Jauhar : *Tazkirat-ul-Waqi'āt*.
10. Rafī'ud-Dīn Shīrāzī : *Tazkirat-ul-Malūk* (1608).
11. Faizī Sirhindī : *Zabd-ul-Tawārīkh*.
12. Mirzā Amīnāi Qazvīnī : *Bādshāhnāma*.
13. Chandar Bhān : *Chahār Chaman*.
14. Jalālud-Dīn Tabātabāī : *Bādshāhnāma*.
15. Muhammad Sādiq : *Subh-i-Sādiq*.
16. Muhammad Tāhir : *Mulakhas*.
17. Qābil Khān : *Ādāb-i-'Ālamgīrī*.
18. *News Letters of Aurangzeb*, referred to as *Akhabārūl* and *Court Bulletins* as well.
19. *Jaipur Records*.
20. Ibrāhīm : *Inshā-i-Ibrāhīmī*.
21. *Kalimāt-i-Tayyībāt*.

22. 'Aqil Khān : *Iqbāl Nāma-i-Aurangzeb*.
23. *News Letters*, Provincial Series, Gujarat.
24. *News Letters*, Provincial Series, Agra.
25. 'Inayāt Ullah : *Kalīmāt-i-Aurangzeb*.
26. 'Inayāt Ullah : *Ahkām-i-Ālamgiri*.
27. Abu'l Hasan : *Ma'aqā'āt-ul-Hasan*.
28. *Khatūl-i-Shivājī*.
29. Jethmall : *Kārnāma-i-Jethmall*.
30. Ishar Dās : *Fatūhat-i-Ālamgiri*.
31. Bhim Sen : *Nuskha-i-Dilkushā*.
32. *Ahkām-i-Ālamgiri*
33. *Dastūr-ul-Amal*.
34. *Zawābat-i-Ālamgiri*.
35. *Khallāq-us-Sayyāq*.
36. Abu'l Fazl Mānūrī : *Aurangzeb Nāma*.
37. *Persian Letters*. (India Office MS.)
38. Girdhar Dass : *Rām Nāma*.
39. *Munshiāt*.
40. *Rugga'āt-i-Khwāya Hasan*.
41. *Aurang Nāma*.
42. Mirza Nathan : *Baharistan-i-Ghaibī*.

PRINTED

1. Abul Qāsim Muhammad : *Tārīkh-i-Firishta*.
2. Abu'l Fazl : *Āīn-i-Akbarī*.
3. *Tūzāk-i-Bāburi*, English translation by Erskine and Leyden, ed. by King.
4. Badāyūnī : *Muntakhīb-ul-Tawārīkh*.
5. Abu'l Fazl : *Akbar Nāma*.
6. Nizam-ud-Din : *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*.
7. *Letters of Abu'l Fazl*.
8. Jahāngir : *Tūzāk-i-Jahāngiri*.
9. Fānī : *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib*.
10. Mu'tamid Khān : *Iqbāl Nāma-i-Jahāngiri*.
11. *Letters of Aurangzeb*.
12. Abdul Hye : *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*.
13. Abdul Hamīd Lāhaurī : *Bādshah Nāma*.

14. Kāzim: *Ālamgīr Nāma*.
15. Sher Khani: *Mīrat-ul-Khayyāl*.
16. Musta'id Khān: *Ma'āsir-i-Ālamgīrī*.
17. Madho Ram: *Inshā-i-Mādhonām*.
18. *Inshā-i-Tāhīr-i-Wahīd*.
19. Ahmad Sirhindi: *Makhtūbat-i-Mullā Ahmad Sirhīndī*.
20. *Bahārīstun-i-Ghātibī*, English abstract with notes by Sri Ram Sharma in *Journal of Indian History*, and *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta.
21. *Rāmāyan-i-Masīhī*.
22. 'Aḥf: *Tārīkh-i-Fīrozshāhī*.
23. Sujān Rai Bhandārī: *Khulāsat-ul-Tawārīkh*.
24. Ghulām Husain: *Rayāz-us-Salāṭīn*.
25. Khāfī Khān: *Muntakhib-ul-Lubāb*.
26. Muhammad Sālih: *Āmal-i-Sālih*.

Sanskrit

1. Jaya Soma: *Biography of Karam Chand, a Jain courtier of Akbar*.
2. Deva Vimala Muni: *Hirasaubhagyam*.
3. Kavindracharya's List: a list of the MSS. in the library of Kavindracharya, published in the Gaekwar Oriental Series.
4. Ranchhor Bhatta: *Raj Prashasti*: a history of Udaipur inscribed on stone on the Raj Samud Lake, near Raj Nagar, Udaipur.

Hindi

1. Nabha Ji: *Bakht Mālī* with commentaries by Priya Dass. It has been translated into English and Urdu.
2. Misra Brothers: *Misra-bandhu-vinoda*: A history of Hindi literature.
3. Man: *Rāj Vilās*. (Nagri Pracharani Sabha.)
4. Tripathi: *Rahīm Sudha*.
5. Sūr Dās: *Sūr Sāgar*.

Gurmukhī

1. Guru Gobind Singh: *Vichitra Natak*.

English

(Mostly translations from Jesuit accounts and accounts of European travellers.)

1. Monserrate: *Account of India*. Translated by Hoyland.
2. Du Jarric: *Akbar and the Jesuits*. Translated by Payne.
3. Father Hosten: *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, V.
4. MacLagan: *Jesuits at the Court of Akbar, J.A.S.B.* (Calcutta).
Makes available in English a good deal of information contained in Jesuit accounts.
5. *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe*, ed. Foster.
6. *Early Travels in India*, ed. Foster.
7. *Travels of S. Manrique*, translated by Hosten and Laurd.
8. Ovington: *Voyage to Surat*.
9. Bernier: *Travels in the Mughal Empire*, translated by Constable.
10. Tavernier: *Travels in India*, translated by Ball.
11. *John Marshal in India*, ed. by S. A. Khan.
12. Manucci: *Storia do Mogor*, translated by Irvine.
13. *English Factories in India*, ed. Foster.
14. *Jahangir and the Jesuits*, translated by Payne.

LATER AUTHORITIES USING CONTEMPORARY MATERIALS

1. Shāh Nawāz Khān: *Maāsir-ul-Umrā*.
2. 'Alī Ahmad Khān: *Mīrāt-i-Ahmadi*.
3. Orme: *A Fragment of History* (Calcutta reprint).
4. Āzād Bilgrāmī: *Khazāin-i-Amrā*.
5. A'zamī: *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*.
6. Bakht Mall: (MS.) *Tārīkh-i-Sikhān*.
7. Shyāmal Dās: (Hindi) *Vīr Vinod*.
8. Gori Shankar Ojha: *History of Udvīpur* (Hindi).

MODERN WORKS

1. A. S. Triton: *The Caliphs and their Non-Muslim Subjects*.
2. P. K. Hitti: *History of the Arabs*.
3. Sri Ram Sharma: *Conversion and Reconversion to Hinduism during the Muslim period*.
4. *Archæological Survey Reports*.
5. *Journal of the U.P. Historical Society* (Allahabad, 1936).
6. *Twentieth Century* (Allahabad, 1936).
7. Qanungo: *Sher Shah*.
8. Sri Ram Sharma: *Sher Shah's Administrative System* (I.H.Q. December, 1936).
9. V. A. Smith: *Akbar, the Great Mughal*.
10. Brown: *A History of Persian Literature*, Vol. III.
11. Shibli: *Shi'r-ul-'Ajam* (History of Persian literature in Urdu), Vol. III.
12. *Farṭūḥ-i-Salūṭin*, ed. Bashir Ahmad.
13. Elliot: *Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muslim India*.
14. MacLagan: *The Jesuits and the Great Mughals*.
15. Sir Wolsley Haig: *Cambridge Shorter History of India: The Muslim Period*.
16. Azād: *Darbār-i-Akbarī*.
17. Nazir Ahmad: *History of India*, Vol. IV.
18. Khosla: *The Mughal Kingship and Nobility*.
19. Smith: *Jain Stupa of Mathura*.
20. Malleson: *Akbar*.
21. Smith: *Jains at the Court of Akbar (The Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume)*.
22. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. IV.
23. Von Naer: *Emperor Akbar*.
24. J. J. Modi: *Parsis at the Court of Akbar*.
25. Blochmann: *Badaoni and the Religious Views of Akbar* (Proceedings of the A.S.B., March, 1869).
26. H. H. Wilson: *Religious Innovations of Akbar*.
27. Vans Kennedy: *Some Notices Respecting the Religion introduced by Emperor Akbar*.
28. Hodiwala: *Studies in Mughal Numismatics*.

29. Qanungo: *Dara Shikoh*.
30. Yusuf Husain: *Prince Dara Shikoh* (Journal of the Muslim University, Aligarh).
31. *Journal of the Punjab Historical Society*, Vols. IV and V.
32. Maccauliffe: *Sikh Religion*.
33. Sohan Lal. '*Umdat-ul-Tawārikh*.'
34. Irvine: *Later Mughals*.
35. *Islamic Culture*, Hyderabad.
36. Sir Jadunath Sarkar: *Aurangzeb*.
37. Sardesai: *Marathi Rajasat*.
38. Rahmān 'Alī: '*Ulmā-i-Hind*.'
39. *Calcutta Review*, 1869.
40. Brown: *Mughal Paintings*.
41. Beni Prasad: *Jahangir*.
42. Saxena: *Shāh Jahān*.
43. Faruqi: *Aurangzeb*.
44. Sri Ram Sharma: *A Bibliography of Mughal India*.
45. C. S. Hargronje: *Mohammedanism*.
46. Maigoloith: *Muhammad*.

INDEX

- ‘Abādāt Khān, discussions in, under Jahāngir, 82; see Assembly Hall for Prayers
- ‘Abbās Sufi, Shah of Persia, 107
- ‘Abdāl, rebel under Shāh Jahān, 103
- ‘Abdul ‘Azīz, Qāzī, 129
- ‘Abdul Ghos, performs prayers in Akbar’s court, 43
- ‘Abdul Haq, 57
- ‘Abdul Karīm, Mir, collects jizya at Burhanpur, 155
- ‘Abdullah, protests against Aurangzeb’s war on Golkanda and Bijapur, 146
- ‘Abdulla Khān Uzbek, Akbar’s letters to, 47, 51
- ‘Abdul Latīf, 57
- ‘Abdul Latīf, Akbar’s tutor, 18
- ‘Abdul Ma‘ālī, 43
- ‘Abdun Nablī, sadr-us-sadr, executes a Brahman, 16; his arrogance, 20; his death, 21; his successor, 34; signed the Infallibility Decree, 38, 39
- ‘Abdur Rahīm, his Hindi poetry, 87
- ‘Abdus Samad, Muslim scholar of Akbar’s reign, 43-4
- Abu’l Faizī, conversion to Shi‘aism, 56
- Abu’l Fazl, his account of Akbar’s attitude towards captive Homū, 15-16; discussions with Muslim scholars, 21; arrival at Akbar’s court after abolition of jizya, 23; Salīm’s allegations against him, 48; his alleged share in leading Akbar away from Islam, 49; Akbar’s biographer, 57; Badāy-ūnī’s allegations against, 67
- Abu’l Fazl Mūnūrī, account of Hindu protests against jizya under Aurangzeb, 153
- Abū Tarāb, sent to destroy temples in Jaipur, 145
- Accession of Jahāngir, 70
- Act of Supremacy, absence of its equivalents under Akbar, 40
- Adī Granth, interpreted by Rām Rāi before Aurangzeb, 165
- ‘Adil Khān, attack on Sri Ranga, 111, 110
- ‘Adil Shāh, 12
- ‘Adil Shāh of Golkanda, inquiry about Akbar’s conversion to Christianity, 65
- Afghan followers of Ibrāhīm, 80
- Afghans, heretical practices of, suppressed by Shāh Jahān, 97
- Agra, Babur’s projected road from, 9; church at Agra, 24, 73; scholars of, 67, 74; Christian cemetery at, 73; baptisms at, 74; decision of cases of sati by the emperor at, 84; roofs set up below salutation balconies at, 97; church destroyed at, 104; reference to Jesuit Missions, 105; Holi riots, 150; stone hurled at Aurangzeb at, 167
- Ahkām-i-‘Alamgiri*, 132
- Ahmad Sirhindī, on Islam under Akbar, 43; under Jahāngir, 71; persecuted by Jahāngir, 80-1; on religious discussions before Jahāngir, 83; reference to his persecution, 85; on the execution of Guru Arjun, 92; see Mulla Shah Ahmad
- Ahmedabad, church established in 1620, 73; temples destroyed, under Shāh Jahān, 104; Rājū expelled from, 111; protest by Yahyā against suppression of musical performances, 124; march of bolras to, 126; mosques nearby occupied by Kolis, 143; burning of dead on banks of the Sabarmati prohibited, 150
- Ahmednagar, mosques destroyed by Bhīm, 145; deshmuks punished for using a palanquin, 150
- Ain-i-Akbarī*, cited on forcible conversions to Islam, 16; list of mansabdārs in, 27; records prices of meat of animals whose slaughter was prohibited, 28, 29; cites Akbar’s opinion on his lack of conformity to Islam, 49;

- examination of, 50; on Dīn-i-Ilāhī, 51; on Hindu scholars under Akbar, 66; on the revenues of Manbah, 156
- Ajmer, temple of Virāha demolished by Jahāngīr at, 73; Jahāngīr's pilgrimage to, 88; Aurangzob's departure from, 145
- Akbar, 10, 12; accession, 15; contemporary atmosphere, 15-17; his heritage, 17-23; marriages to Hindu princesses, 22, 110; influence of Abul Fazl and others on his religious policy, 21; political reasons for his religious policy (?) 22-3; religious reasons, 23; Hindu temples under, 23, 136, 139; jizya abolished, 23, 152; pilgrimage tax abolished, 24; attitude towards prisoners of war, 25, 107; establishes a translation department, 25; permits conversions from Islam, 25-6; removes disabilities of non-Muslims for public services, 26, 129; his respect for the religious sentiments of Hindus, 27-30; killing of animals partially prohibited, 28, 85, 112; means of enforcing this prohibition 28-9; celebrates Hindu festivals, 29; discourages child marriages, permits widow remarriages, prohibits unwilling sati, 30; forbids marriages between near relations, 31; controls sale of liquor, 31; regulates prostitution, 31; comparison with British methods in India, 31-2; control of beggary, gambling, 32; Mīna Bazar, 32; trial by ordeal, 32; introduction of Ilāhī year, 32; the patron of literature, religious and secular, 33; reorganizes *sadr-us-sudūr*'s department, 34; examines claims for religious grants, 34-5; attitude towards shaiḫs and faqīrs, 35; court ceremonies: Tūlādīm adopted, 36; Infallibility Decree, examined 37-41; anxiety to be considered a good Muslim, 40; regulations about mixed marriages, 41; alleged persecution of Islam, 41-6; alleged hypocrisy, 46; religious beliefs, charges against him examined, 46-61; declaration of faith, 47; respect for the sun, perpetual fire in the Court, 50; attitude towards the Prophet, 50-1; see Dīn-i-Ilāhī; his miracle, 53-4; alleged claim to Divine honours, 55, 56, 57; critics, 55-8; achievements, 58-60; Hindu man abducts, 68-9; his death, 70; changes introduced by his religious policy, 69-70; result of his religious policy, 71; his liberalism, 94; his fondness for Shāh Jahān, 91; implications of his religious policy, 103; reference to the secular State, 141; revenues of Gujarat, 156; reference to his comprehensive State, 168; religious policy and Aurangzob, 169; his claim to Divine rights, 192, 193, 194; modification of criminal laws, 195; his *sadr-us-sudūr*, 198
- Akbar Nāma*, 16, 50
- Akhbarāt*, 120, 130, 156
- Alamgīr Nāma*, 118, 130, 186
- Alā-ud-Dīn, sumptuary laws of, 6; praised by Muslim chroniclers 11; persecution of Hindus, 59; attitude towards Muslim law, 126
- Alī Maqjīd, 45
- Alī Sirhindī, 127
- Allahabad, temples destroyed by Shāh Jahān, 103
- Almanacs, their drawing up forbidden, 120
- Alquran, 65
- Alup, 148
- Amal-i-Sālīh*, 97
- Amāra, Sumas appointed, among the *lohrās*, 126
- Amārat Khān, 158
- Amar Singh, Rana of Udaipur, 131
- Ambor, temple destroyed under Aurangzob, 145
- Amīn, appointed for collection of jizya, 154; Amīn-i-Jizya for Mulwa, 155; for the Deccan, 156
- Amīr, Sayyid, 135
- Amroha, see Guru Kishan
- Anandpur, 167
- Anāyat Khān*, *Diwān-i-Khālsa*, 153
- Anglicanism and Elizabeth, 200-201
- Anglicans and their persecution by Cromwell, 170
- Ani Rāi Singhdalan, 81

Ani Rāi, son of Guru Hargōvind, 187
 Anūp Singh, Raja of Bikāner, 131
 Anurodh Singh, Raja of Bikāner, 131
 Apostasy, its punishment, 6-7; a crime under Shāh Jahān, 111; punished by Aurangzeb, 127
 Arab conquest of Sind, 152
 Arabic words in Persian, discontinued under Akbar, 33
 'Arif-Husain, Shaikh, 43
 'Arif Qandahārī, cited, 89
 Arjun, Guru, and Jahāngīr, 76; put to death by Jahāngīr, 77, 79, 187
 Articles, Thirty-nine, 201
 Asad Khān, his orders about destruction of temples in Orissa, 138
 Asaf Khān, patronizes Nityānanda, 113; praised by Jagannāth, 113
 Asia, 152
 Asoka, compared with Akbar, 28
 Assembly Hall for prayers, 42; see 'Abūdāt Khāna
 Astrologers, Hindus at Jahāngīr's court, 85
Atharva-Veda, Persian translation ordered, 25
 Atal Rāi, son of Guru Hargōvind, 187
 Aurangabad, anin of, 157
 Aurangzeb, 1; compared with Akbar, 28; Ilāhī Era under, 33; Tulādān under, 37, 119; destroys temples at Multā, 91; anti-Rajput bias, 102; serves as Viceroy of Gujarat, 103; religious policy compared with that of Shāh Jahān, 114-15; stops celebrations of solar New Year, 118; court ceremonies under, 118; participates in *Dasahra*, 119; abolishes stamping of *Kalima* on the coins, 119; discontinues Jharokā-darshan, 119; see Almanacs; discontinues *tika*, 120; dismisses astronomers and astrologers, appoints Muslim astrologers, 120; forbids use of silver plate in the court, 120-1; stops manufacture of cloth of gold, 121; moral regulations, 121; enforces prohibition, 121-3; permits the use of wine to Europeans, 122; proscribes *Divān-i-Hāfiz*, 123; orders regarding prostitutes, 123; prohibits un-

willing sati, and castration of young children, 123; prohibits bhāng, 123; forbids public singing, 124; gambling, 124; forbids use of cloth of gold, 125; forbids music in Kashtān, 125; punished men with Christian tendencies, 126; prohibits lights on the tombs of saints, 126; see Bohras; stops the celebration of Mubarram, 127; persecution of Sarnad and Mullā Shāh Badakhshī, 128; persecutes heretics, 129; Hindus in public services, 129-36, 149, 178-80; orders the conquest of Palaman, 137; destroyed Hindu schools and temples, 136-8; Rajput war, 144; the destruction of temples in friendly states, 145; his war on Bijapur and Golkonda opposed by some divines, 146; appoints an officer to destroy temples in Maharashtra, 148; reimposed pilgrimage tax, 149; his punitive regulations against the Hindus, 149-51; temples in the Deccan, 149; his illness, 151; reimposition of jizya and remissions, 153-60; proselytizing activities, 160ff., 181ff.; methods of conversion used, 163ff.; forcible mass conversion, 164; summons Guru Har Rai, 165, 189; and the Sikhs, 165, 176ff., 177, 188ff.; grants jagir to Rām Rāi, 166; executes Tegh Bahādūr, 166, 190; his failure, discussed, 168; his letter about the battle of Chamkaur, 167; orders Shāh 'Ālam to persecute Sikhs, 168; his religious persecutions, 170; success of prohibition, Mannucci, *Inshā-i-Mādhorām*, Ovington and Travernier quoted, 171; authorities quoted regarding sati, 172; destruction of temples at Benares, *Ganj-i-Arshadi* quoted, 173-4; opposition to the reimposition of the jizya, 175; the Hindu mansabdārs, 178ff.; claims to Divine rights, 191-3, modification to Muslim Law given up, 196; his accession and the sadr-us-sadr, 197

Austin, 54

Ayodhya, temples destroyed at, 9, 148

- Bābā of Bakula, 166, 189
 Bābar, 1; religious policy, 8; Muslims not to pay stamp duties, 9; demolition of temples, 9; alleged will, 9; love of adventure referred to, 18; attitude towards the Shī'as, 39; his non-recognition of the Khalifa, 199; question of his successor, 200
 Badāyūnī, on execution of heretics, 16; accompanies Man Singh against Rana Pratāp, 17; on behaviour of theologians in Akbar's court, 20; on Akbar's respect for Hindu sentiments, 27-8; on Hindu celebration of the Dīpāvalī, 29; criticism of Akbar's regulations about wine, 31; as Akbar's critic, 33-4, 38-40, 56-8; on Hāhī sect, 35; attitude towards *siyāda*, 36; on contemporary practices with regard to mixed marriages, 41; on Akbar's Islam, 42; statements examined, 43; on the sacred buildings to house the imprint of the Prophet's foot, 44; on the use of the name Muhammad under Akbar, 45; on Islam under Akbar, 46, 49; on Akbar's religious beliefs, 49; on Dīn-i-Hāhī, 51; on admissions to the Dīn-i-Hāhī, 52; on miracle working saints, 54; on four degrees of devotion to Akbar, 54; on Akbar's attitude towards the Prophet, 57
Bādshāhnāma, see Lāhaurī
 Bahadurpur, 158
 Bahādur Shah, 10
 Bahādur Singh, 133
 Bairam Khān, 10, 15
 Bakala, Bābā of, selection as Sikh guru, 190
 Bakhtāwar Singh, conversion of, 10
 Balabhūcāryā, 142
 Bāl Chandra and Akbar, 78
 Banda, 167
 Banera, 134, 140
 Bāqī, Mir, 9
 Bārckzai, Afghans, departure of Sikhs for their country, 167-8
 Bartoli, on the foundation of Dīn-i-Hāhī, 51
 Barw Nagar, temple destroyed at, 146
 Bāyazūl, converts a temple at Benares into a mosque, 17
 Boards, Aurangzob's law regarding length of, 125
 Bockot, 54
 Beef, its use under Akbar, 27-8
 Beggar problem, under Akbar, 32
 Beghna, 109
 Benares, Brahmins accused of imparting education to Muslims, 139; scandal about temples, 138; temples built in Akbar's reign, 24; destroyed by Shāh Jahān, 103; destroyed by Aurangzob, 136, 141, 173-4
 Bengal, conversions in, 7; shāikhī exiled to Bengal by Akbar, 35; Nū'mat Allāh summoned from, 129; killing of animals in, 112; destruction of temples in, 143; temples built in Aurangzob's reign, 149
 Benī Dāsa, diwān of Bihar under Shāh Jahān, 101
 Benī-Mālho, temple of, 174
 Benī Prasad, Dr., on Jahāngīr and Jains, criticized, 79; on Jahāngīr's religion, 88
 Berar, executions in, 111; revenue of, under Aurangzob and Akbar, 156
 Bernier, on pilgrimage tax, 149
 Bhadauri, 106; apostates of, 108
Bhagavad Gītā, translated into Persian under Shāh Jahān, 112
 Bhagwān Dās, governor under Akbar, 26; on Dīn-i-Hāhī, 66; on destruction of a temple in Amher, 145
 Bhakkar, leaders of the Hāhī sect, exiled to, 35
 Bhakt Māl, on Rām Rāi's performance of miracles, 165; on Guru Togh Bahādur's execution, 166; on Aurangzob and the Sikhs, 187-90
 Bhakti movement, its effect upon Akbar's religious policy, 21
Bhang, sale of, stopped by Jahāngīr, 84; see Aurangzob
 Bhār Māl, provincial diwān under Shāh Jahān, 101
 Bharoch, 126
 Bhilsa, 147
 Bhīm, destroys mosques at Ahmednagar, 144-5; raja of Banora, 149
 Bhimbar, apostate Muslims of, 108

- Bhopal, 9
 Bible, Arabic and Persian translations presented to Jahāngīr, 87
 Bihar, Hindu dīwān, under Shāh Jahān, 101; Daud Khan of, 137
 Bijai Singh, reported for idol worship, 147
 Bijapur, 136; invasion of, by Aurangzeb, 127; invasion objected to by divines, 146; temples destroyed in, 146
 Bikaner, 22; Rāi Singh and Mān Singh of, 78; Rai Singh and Jahāngīr, 83; rajas during Aurangzeb's reign, 131
 Bindraban, temples built by Mān Singh referred to, 24, 104, 141-2
 Biran Dev Sisodia, 156
 Birbar, desecration of Kangra by Mughal expedition under, 17; influence on Akbar, 49; only Hindu member of Dīn-i-Ilāhī, 64; and Badāyūnī, 56
 Bir Singh Bundelū, builder of the Keshav Rāi temple of Muttra, 73, 103, 141
 Bishalpur, temples of, 149
 Bishun Singh, Raja of Jaipur, 131, 133, 141
 Bithal Das (Gaur, Raja, mansabdār under Shāh Jahān, 101
 Blasphemy, laws regarding, 6; under Shāh Jahān, 111
 Blochmann, on Akbar's prohibition of killing kine, 27; criticized, 28, 43; on Jahāngīr's religion, 88
 Bours, wild, hunting of by Jahāngīr, 88-9
 Bohrās, persecuted by Aurangzeb, 126
 Botelho, on Akbar's faith, 47; on Akbar's desire to found a new religion, 51
 Brahmins, exempted from jizya, 2; ordered to pay jizya under Feroz Shāh Tughlak, 2; persecution under Sikander Lodī, 6; appointed as judges, 27; of Sind, of Multan, and Benares, punished by Aurangzeb for imparting religious education, 139-40
 British, religious toleration, 59
 Budh Singh, Raja of Bikaner, 131
 Bulāqī, 200
 Burhanpur, 85, 154; amin of, 156
 Caliphs of God, Mughal Emperors as, 191-3
 Cambay, Christian church at, 24; reputed conversion of the customs officers of, 75
 Carnatic, Sri Ranga Ill of the, 110
 Castration of children stopped by Jahāngīr, 84
 Cavalier Parliament, 169
 Cemeteries, Christian, built at Lahore and Agra under Jahāngīr, 73
 Chahār Taslūn under Shāh Jahān, 95
 Chamkaur, battle of, 167
 Champāsani, 142
 Chānda, his request for conversion, 160
 Chandur Bhān, Rāi, 101
 Chandori, temples of, demolished under Rābur, 9
 Chāndū Gāl, dīwān of Lahore and Guru Arjun, 77
 Charles II, his Declaration of Indulgence, 152
 Charles X, of France, compared with Sulīm, 12; and Aurangzeb, 170
 Chhaila, qānūngō of Betar, executed, 111
 Child-marriage discouraged by Akbar, 30
 Chintāman, temple destroyed, 104
 Chintāmanī, Hindu poet, 113
 Chistia Muslims, their leader persecuted by Jahāngīr, 80
 Chitor, Humāyūn's refusal to attack, 10; treatment of prisoners of war taken at Chitor, 25; temples destroyed at, 44
 Christianity, 56
 Christians, allowed by Akbar to make converts, 25; celebrate Easter and Christmas, 82; allowed to manufacture wine, 111-12; Christian Fathers, warned by Akbar, 50; allowed by Jahāngīr to build churches, 73; paid stipends by Jahāngīr, 76
 Chunar, fortress of, 80
 Churches, at Agra and Lahore, 24; closed at Agra by Jahāngīr, 73; built at Ahmedabad and Hooghly under Jahāngīr, 73; destroyed at Agra, 104
 Churru, 62
 Circumcision, Akbar's orders about, 31

- Citizens, field of activities under Mughal Emperors, 201
- Clarendon Code, referred to, 169
- Cloth of gold, use restricted by Aurangzeb, 125
- Conversions, from Islam, 25; allowed by Akbar, 70; to Hinduism, 6, 11, 106, 107; forcible, under Shāh Jahān, 109; conversions to Islam, 7, 25, 26, 11, 72, 108, 109, 162, 183-5
- Conversions, several methods of, under Aurangzeb, 163-4
- Conversions to Christianity allowed by Jahanگیر, 25, 74
- Converts, Hindus not allowed to make, 7; superintendent of, appointed by Shāh Jahān, 118
- Coryat, on Jahanگیر, 74; on Jahanگیر's religion, 87
- Council of Regency, under Khurram, 94
- Court ceremonies under Akbar, 30, 70; under Jahanگیر, 81; under Shāh Jahān, 95; under Aurangzeb, 118ff.
- Court musicians, under Shāh Jahān, 98
- Cromwell, perceptions of Anglicans referred to, 170
- Cultural contacts between Hindus and Muslims, under Jahanگیر, 86; under Shāh Jahān, 112
- Customs duties, Muslims exempted, 151
- Dabistān-i-Mazāhib* on Dīn-i-Hīlā, 51; on Guru Hargovind's imprisonment, 77; on conversions to Hinduism from Islam, 107
- Dahad, jizya remitted at, 158
- Dalair, destroys temple at Karor, 145
- Dalpat, Hindu of Sirhind, executed for converting a Muslim girl, 106
- Damodar Lal, priest of the Govardhan temple, 142
- Dances forbidden at court by Aurangzeb, 118
- Dānyāl, learns Portuguese, 56; his sons baptized, 74
- Dārā, attempts to prove extension of toleration to Hindus lawful, 112; as a Sūfi, 112; his influence on Shāh Jahān, 104; praised by Jagannāth, 113; a latitudinarian in religion, 118; his association with Sarmad, 127; deputy of Shāh Jahān, 128; his reputed meeting with Guru Tār Rāi, 165
- Darshaniyas*, exiled by Akbar, 52
- Dār-ul-Harb, India, 198
- Dār-ul-Insā, officer in charge of, 101
- Dār-ul-Islām, India as, 198
- Dasahra*, celebrated by Jahanگیر, 82; participation in, by Aurangzeb, 119; distribution of robes on, 120
- Dastūrī Melurjī Rānā, a Parsi priest, 35
- Daud Khān, Viceroy of Bihar, 137
- Daulatmand, 109
- Dayānt Rāi, 101
- Decani, 47; Hindu dīwān under Shāh Jahān, 101; Aurangzeb, Viceroy of, 102; Jai Singh sent to, 132; collection of jizya stopped in, 158
- Declaration of Indulgence, 152
- De Graaf on the destruction of Hindu temples and schools by Aurangzeb, 110, 113
- Dehra Dun, site given to Rām Rāi, by Aurangzeb, 166
- Dellī, Tāj-ud-Dīn of, 36; mosques not destroyed at, 45; salutation balcony roofed at, 97; sarnad reaches, 127; idols brought to, 141; burning on the Jumna prohibited, 150; Muslim dynasties of, 168; Har Kishan comes to, 190
- Desecration of temples, *see* Ayo-dhya, Benares, Chauderī, Kangra
- Despotism of the Mughal Emperors, its nature, 194; *see* Jahanگیر, Shāh Jahān, Aurangzeb, Gujarat
- David Ghat, jizya remitted in, 158
- Devī Chand, of Manoharpur, reinstated to office on conversion, 161
- Devī Singh, jizya collected in his jāgīr, 155
- Devī Singh, of Alup, temples in his house destroyed, 148
- Dhammi, fort desecrated, 103
- Dharm Pura, a Hindu beggar colony, 32
- Dharm Shālā at Churru, 62
- Dhīraj Mall, 188
- Digests of Hindu Laws, 194

- Din-i-Ilāhī*, its nature, date of foundation, 51; examined, 51-2; and *Darshanīgā*, 52; and Akbar, 8, 52; the obligation of members, 53; number of adherents, 53; Bhagwān Dās and admission into, 66; Jahāngīr, as alleged follower of, 87
- Dipāvālī, 5; under Akbar, 29; gambling on, under Jahāngīr, 82
- Divine Faith, 52; see *Din-i-Ilāhī*
- Divine Right of Kings, 55, 192-3
- Diwāns, provincial, under Jahāngīr, 83
- Dorāb Khān, sent to Khandola, 144
- Dr Jarric, his charges against Akbar, 48-9, 52
- Durgā, converted, 109
- Durgā Dās Rāthor, 135
- Durjan Sāl, converted, 109
- Dwarka, public worship in the temple stopped, 148
- Easter, celebrated by Christians under Jahāngīr, 82
- Ecclesiastical Department, 20
- Education, religious, of Hindus penalized by Aurangzeb, 140
- Edward VI and Protestantism in England, 201
- Elizabeth, extent of toleration under, 59; and Anglicanism, 200
- Employment of Hindus under Aurangzeb, 134
- England, Roman Catholics in, 8; Cavalier Parliament of, referred to, 169
- English Factors, on buying back of Hindu temples, 148
- Europe, 47, 60, 105, 152, 200
- European travellers, descriptions of Jahāngīr's religion, 87
- Exemption from jizya, 157-8
- Famine in the Punjab, 110
- Fatwā, influence on Akbar, 121; arrival at the court, 23; on the Prophet, 50, 67; on Akbar, 57; not referred to as heretic, 67
- Fatwā Sirhindī, 40
- Farāmīn-i-Salātīn*, 34
- Farmāns* of Aurangzeb, 118
- Fatwa-i-'Ālamgiri* on the jizya, 1; on sumptuary laws, 6; on punitive measures against the Hindus, 150; completion and authority, 195
- Fathers, Christian, 52, 56
- Fathers of the Third Mission, 46
- Faṭh Ullah Shīrāzī, Mir, 43
- Foroz Shāh, religious policy of, 2-4; imposes jizya on Brahmans, 152
- Festivals, religious, 81
- Finch, on the worship of Akbar's tomb, 58; on Jahāngīr's religion, 87
- Fireworks, prohibited by Aurangzeb, 150
- Frishita, 57
- Firoz Jang, 109
- Fishing prohibited by Akbar, 28
- France, Charles X of, compared with Salīm, 12; with Aurangzeb, 170
- Froude, on religious quarrels, 169
- Gadāī, Shaikh, 34
- Gambhīra, see Akbar, Dipāvālī, Jahāngīr, Aurangzeb
- Gangādhar, 62
- Gang-i-Arshadī*, on destruction of temples at Benares under Aurangzeb, 173-4
- Gauri Shankar Ojha, 61
- Ghayas Pur, temples destroyed at, 147
- Ghāzī, Akbar as a, 15-16
- Ghāzī Khān, 38-9
- Ghiās-ud-Dīn Tughlaq, 6
- Ghoris, rulers of Delhi, 168
- Ghulām Muḥammad, 146
- Girdhar Dās, translator of *Rāmāyana*, 86
- Goa, 65; annual Jesuit letter from, 74
- Goanese, converted to Islam, 72
- Gobind Singh, Guru, leaves Anandpur, his two sons arrested, 107; successor of Tegh Bahādur, incarnation of Guru Nanak, 166
- Gold cloth, manufacture in royal workshops stopped, 121
- Golkonda, King of, 96, 114, 136; invasion of, by Aurangzeb, 127; Aurangzeb's war opposed, 146
- Gopināth, priest of Govardhan temple, 142
- Gorakhtiri, visit of Jahāngīr to, 83
- Govardhan temple, built by Balabhadra, 142
- Governor of Bengal, 83; of Surat, 81; see Gujarat; of Orissa, Raja Kalyan, 83

- Govindwal, the Kāfir of, commuted by Ahmad Sirhindi, 92
 Grand Mufti, Sadr-i-Jahān, 38, 39
 Grants, to Hindus, resumed by Aurangzeb, 136
 Guerrero, on conversions to Christianity, 74; on the recovery of Muqarib Khan's son, 76; on Jahāngir's restoration of Muslim festivities, 81; on Jahāngir's religious discussions, 82; on Jahāngir's prohibition of slaughter of animals, 85
 Gulbadan Begum, 44
 Gujarat, 21, 44, 136; Jain idols broken in, 17; Jahāngir's visit to, 78; governor of, 82, 83, 103; prohibition of slaughter of animals in, 86; temples destroyed by Shāh Jahān in, 103; Hindus of, 104; khotas in, 126; temples destroyed in, 137; Hindu temples in, 143; jizya in, 156; jizya in arrears, 155
 Gujrat (Punjab), marriages between Hindus and Muslim girls, 106
 Gurdāsā, Bhāi, 189
 Gurditta, Bābā, 188
 Gwalior, 9, 81
 Habsht, Mir, execution of, 16
 Haidar, Mirzā, Hindu convert, 107
 Haig, Sir Wolsley, on Akbar's persecution of Islam, 41, 58
 Haitheswar temples, demolished, 146
 Hakīm, half brother of Akbar, 48
 Hakīm (filānī, 49
 Hardwar, 74; temples destroyed by Aurangzeb at, 148
 Hargam, rebellion of Hindu chief, 103
 Hargōvind, imprisoned by Jahāngir, 77; conversion of Muslims, 107; Balcht Mall on his work, 187
 Har Kishan, accession as guru, 165, 188; summoned by Aurangzeb, 188; his death, 165-6; 188-9
 Har Rāi, guru, 165; son and successor of Hargōvind, 187; his pontificate, 187
 Hasan, Mir, 127
 Hāshimī, professor, 128
 Harivamsa, Persian translation ordered, 25
 Hāthī, his dependants converted, 109
 Hemū, his rise, 12; his death, 15; his father persecuted, 16
 Hijri era, 32; introduced by Aurangzeb, 118
 Hindus, under the Sultanate, 1-6; and jizya, 3; under Shor Shāh, 11; governors under Akbar, 69, 132; under Shāh Jahān, 102, 105, 106, 108; of Chhārat, temples restored, 104; in Revenue Department under Aurangzeb, 134; Aurangzeb resumes all grants made to, 135; of Surat and their temples, 143; forbidden by Aurangzeb to burn their dead by the Janna, 150; protest against jizya, 153; of Barhampur and the collection of jizya, 155; astrologers at Jahāngir's court, 85; bakshis of Akbar, 69; converts, permitted to return to their original faith, 6-7; converts to Islam under Aurangzeb, 160ff., 180ff.; diwāns of Akbar, 69; in public services under Akbar, 27, 40, 68, 69, 129; under Jahāngir, 83; in the services of Bijapur and Golkonda, 127; their employment under Aurangzeb, 134
 Hindu Beg, an officer of Bābur, 9
 Hindu Calendar, use of, under Aurangzeb, 118
 Hindu, festivals, participation by the Mulsimadans, 82; festivals under Akbar, 29; under Aurangzeb, 149-50; see also Dusāhra, Dipāvalī, and Rākhi; idols, 3; law, digests of, 195; law of property changed by Shāh Jahān, 108, 194; officials in Muslim States, 29; poets, receive Shāh Jahān's patronage, 113; princesses, their conversion under Shāh Jahān, 110; mansabdārs of Shāh Jahān, 98-102, 129-132; mansabdārs of Akbar, 68-9; mansabdārs of Aurangzeb, 129-31, 149, 178ff.; mansabdārs, Aurangzeb's policy towards, 134; officials and the payment of jizya, 154; religious works, translation into Persian under Akbar, 71; scholars mentioned in the *Ain-i-Akbarī*, 66; see Temples
 Hindu temple, of Jodhpur, converted into a mosque, 11

- Hawkins, receiver *Jahāngīr's* permission to marry a Muslim girl, 75; on Hindu mansabdārs under *Jahāngīr*, 83; on *Jahāngīr's* preference for Muslim civil servants, 84
- Holi, 5; celebration stopped by Aurangzeb, 149
- Hooghly, church opened at, 73; Portuguese at, 101
- House of Lords, 39
- House of Worship, established by Akbar, 19, 29; see 'Abādāt Khāna and Assembly Hall for Prayers
- Humāyūn, accession, 9; religious policy, 10; expelled from India, 18; introduces *siyida*, 36
- Husain Khān, Governor of Lahore, his sumptuary laws, 16
- Husain Khān, Khwāja, 167
- Husain Malik, 126
- Hyderabad, 127; destruction of temples in, 146; annū of, 156; its conquest, and remission of *jizya*, 159
- 'Ibādāt Khāna, discussion in, 22, 57
- Ibrāhīm, Shaikh, persecuted by *Jahāngīr*, 79-80, 81
- Ibrāhīm Sirhindī, Hājī, 21
- Ichchhabad, temple destroyed by Shāh Jahān at, 103
- 'Id, slaughter of animals postponed, 86; under Shāh Jahān, 90
- Idols, broken in Kuch Bihar, 137; burnt by Shāh Jahān, 103; worship tolerated in Akbar's palace, 19
- Ilāhī, calendar, reputed discontinuance by Shāh Jahān, 97; sect, leader exiled, 35; year, introduced, 32; year, use under Aurangzeb, 118
- 'Inām Qult, 109
- Indar Singh, 132
- Indian Historical Records Commission, 9
- Infallibility Decree discussed, 37, 196
- Inquisition, 55
- Inshā-i-Mādhorām*, on prohibition under Aurangzeb, 171
- Interest, payable on Hindu loans, 36
- Irach, see *Juma' Masjid*
- Ireland, 8, 45, 169
- Islam, forced conversions to, 7; conversions from, 25; hereditary monarchy in, 200; its early history and Akbar, 49; in Akbar's reign, 43; an organized church in, 196; Mughal emperors as agents of, 198
- Islām Yār, 160
- Jadrūp, Gosāin, 61, 83
- Jagunnāth, 113
- Jagunnāth Puri, temple destroyed by Feroz Shāh, 4
- Jagat Singh, Raja of Kota, 131
- Jahānārā's mosque, 142
- Jahāngīr, 24, 28, 45, 55, 57, 94, 97, 106; and *siyida*, 36; and the award of Shist, 54; a follower of Dīn-i-Ilāhī, 66; accession, 70-1; conversions to Islam under, 72; destruction of temples, 73, 89; his grandson baptized, 74; search for a Christian wife, 75; relations with Sikhs, 76; reputed conversion to Christianity, 76, 87; and Guru Arjun, 77; imprisons Guru Hargovind, 77; relations with Jains, 78; persecution of heretic Muslims, 79; Muslim festivals under, 81; celebrates Rākhi, 81; celebrates Dasahra and Dipāvali, 82; holds religious assembly, 83; suppresses social evils, 84; weighed during an eclipse, 85; day of accession, 86; presented with Arabic and Persian translations of the Bible, 87; patronizes painting, 87; and Islam, 87; his religion as described by European travellers, 87-8; charged with the hunting of wild boars, 88; religious policy, 90; said to have been poisoned by Shāh Jahān, 91; his religion, 93; his *sadr-us-sadūrs*, 93; marriages with Hindu princesses referred to, 110; attitude towards slaughter of animals referred to, 112; reference to Hindus in public services under, 129; and Hindu temples, 136; punishes two Muslims for going to yogis, 140; his claim to Divine Right, 192-4; as guardian of Islam, 199

- Jai Chand Sūrī, invited to Akbar's court, 22
- Jaimal's widow, 63
- Jain idols destroyed at Urvā, 9; demolished in Gujarat, 17
- Jainism, 54
- Jains, orders for their expulsion issued by Jahāngīr, 78; procure protection of animals from slaughter in Gujarat, 86; under Jahāngīr, 90
- Jain scholars at Akbar's court, 22; temples protected by Akbar in Gujarat, 17; temples built, 24
- Jaipur, 104, 131, 133, 141, 146; public worship of idols in, 146
- Jaipur Records*, Hindu mansabdārs mentioned in, 130; on the payment of jizya by Raja Rām Singh, 154
- Jai Singh I of Jaipur, given gifts on Muslim festivals, 96; allowed to appoint a priest at his temple at Bindrabān, 104; given robes of honour on Dasahra, 119; Aurangzeb's contemporary, 131; sent to Deccan with full civil and military powers, 132; a mansab-dār of 7,000, 133; effect of his death on Aurangzeb's policy, 135, 139
- Jai Singh II, contemporary of Aurangzeb, 131; recommended for deputy governorship, 133
- Jai Singh, Rana of Udaipur, Aurangzeb's contemporary, 131
- Jaisinghpura, idol worship in and attempts to prevent it, 147
- Jalāl-ad-Dīn of Bengal, persecutions under, 7
- Jalāl-ad-Dīn, commentator on the Qur'ān, 19
- Jalāl-ul Dīn, Qāzi of Multan, forgery by, 21
- Jalāl-ul-Dīn, chief qāzi, 38, 39
- Jalāl-ul-Dīn Mullānī, Akbar's supporter, 57
- Jalāl-ul-Dīn, 86
- Jalāl Gujurātī Sayyid, appointed *sadr-us-sadr* by Shāh Jahān, 96
- Jānī, Mirzā, 52
- Jaswant Singh, given an elephant by Shāh Jahān on the 'Id, 96; premier noble under Shāh Jahān, 102, 130; given robes of honour on the Dasahra, 119; governor of Gujarat, leader of expedition against the Marathes, 132; death referred to, 135, 143; connexion with priests of Govardhana, 142
- Jalore, jizya of, 155
- Jat operations, conversion after, 185
- Jesuits, on Akbar's delinquencies, 48; given daily allowances by Jahāngīr, 72; dazzled by Jahāngīr's toleration, 88; under Shāh Jahān, 104
- Jesuit Fathers, sent for by Akbar, 44; on destruction of mosques by Akbar, 45; on mosques in Delhi, 45; as critics of Akbar's religion, 55; present Jahāngīr with Persian and Arabic translations of the Bible, 87
- Jesuit, Annual Letter from Goa, 74
- Jesuit Mission, the third, 46; on Akbar's new religion, 51; at Agra and Lahore, 105
- Jharoka Darshan, 50; sitting in, discontinued by Aurangzeb, 119
- Jizya, its origin and imposition in India, 1-3, 7; compared with recusant fines under Elizabeth, 8; under Sher Shāh, 10; abolition by Akbar, 23, 40, 70; Abū'l Fazl on its abolition, 61-2; Ahmad on its necessity, 62; under Shāh Jahān, 102; imposition and collection of, under Aurangzeb, 66, 151; aims of, under Aurangzeb, 154; its levy on Rajput rajas, 153, 154; percentage of, to revenues, 156; of Palampur, Jalore and Gujarat, 155; remission of, 158; grades of assessment, 157; levy of, 169; opposition to its reimposition under Aurangzeb, reasons for its imposition, 175
- Jodhpur, temple converted into a mosque by Sher Shāh, 11; Mādhov Rao of, 11; Maharaja Jaswant Singh of, 130; annexed, 133; Aurangzeb's desire to annex, 135; Khān-i-Jahān sent to destroy temples in, 144
- Jogī Pura, a Hindu beggar colony, 32
- Jujahār Singh Bundelā, military operations against, 103; his rebellion referred to, 109
- Junna' Masjid, at Trich, 147
- Junna rivor, *see* Hindus

Kabul, 9, 45, 47, 109, 132
 Kachhwāhī princes, 133; *see* Jai Singh
 Kafir of Govindval, 92; *see also* Gurm Arjun
 Kalima, stamped on coins under Jāhāngīr and Shāh Jahān, discontinued by Aurangzeb, 119
 Kalimāt-i-Paqqibāt, on employment of Hindus under Aurangzeb, 131, 172, 171, 177
 Kalyān, 72
 Kalyān, Bhāti, of Khatpur, 107
 Kalyan, Raja, governor of Orissa, 83
 Kalyānā, Bhāt, Ram Rai's companion, 188
 Kamaulākar Bhakti, the jurist, 113
 Kamalpur, 82
 Kangra, temples destroyed by Feroz Shāh, 4; temple decorated by Akbar, 17; destroyed by Jāhāngīr, 73, 89, 103
 Kanakroli, Vaishnava idol brought to, 142
 Kanwar, religious fair held at, 146
 Karm (band), 22
 Kavar, temple destroyed by Dalair, 145
 Karori, Muslims replaced Hindu, 135
 Kāshī Dās Rāi, mansabdar of Shāh Jahān, 101
 Kashmir, 2, 7, 125, 127, 128; Akbar's visits to, 28; Shāh Jahān returns from, 106; temples destroyed by Shāh Jahān, 103
 Kabak, orders regarding the destruction of temples in, 138
 Kavindaricārya, leader of a deputation to Shāh Jahān against pilgrimage tax, 102; commentator of the *Pigveda*, 113
 Kāzira, Muhammad, Aurangzeb's chronicler, 130
 Kedarpur, temple destroyed under Aurangzeb, 148
 Kesho Rāi, temple of, 104; railings removed, 139; built by Rāo Bir Singh Bundelā, 141; destroyed, 142
 Khairpura, beggar colony established by Akbar, 32
 Khalifa, disrespectful language against, punished, 127; position of, 196

Khalifat Ullah, a title used by Akbar, 55; *see* Caliph
 Khanava, battle of, 9
 Khānda Rāi, temple destroyed, 104, 147
 Khandela, temple destroyed at, 144
 Khandesh, amir of, 156
 Khān-i-Azam, journey to Mecca, 41
 Khān-i-Jahān, sent to Jodhpur to destroy temples, 141
 Khota Kheri, fort conquered, 103
 Khuljis, 18, 168
 Khizr Khān, punished for blasphemy, 16
 Khojas, under Aurangzeb, 126
 Khotan, 107
 Khudāyār Khān, ordered to send help against the Sikhs, 167
 Khurram, reputed follower of Ahmad Sirhindi, 80; asked to perform Tulādān as a protective measure, 85; President of the Council of Regency, 91
 Khusrū, 76, 78, 79, 83, 94, 201
 Kijori Pur, 107, 166
 Kishan, Guru of Amroha, converted, 110
 Kishan Singh, Raja of Kota, 131
 Kota, Rajas of, 131
 Kṛpā, idol of, set up at Kanakroli, 142
 Kuch Bihar, destruction of temples in, 137
 Kumbhu Dās, at Akbar's court, 61
 Kārnish, introduced by Humāyūn, 36
 Lāhauri, *Bādshāhnāma* of, 97
 Lahore, sumptuary laws promulgated at, 16; church at, 24; Muslim theologians at, 65; cemeteries set up at, under Jāhāngīr, 73; conversions to Christianity at, 74; Shaikh Ibrāhīm of, 79-80; Saint Miān Mir of, 82; salutation balcony roofed at, 97; Diwān Sobha Chand of, 101; Jesuit Mission at, 105; Muḥā Shāh Badakhshī at, 128; disturbance created by Sikhs at, 167
 Lājpat, conversion of, 161
 Lakhori, destruction of temples at, 145
 Lalta, temple destroyed at, 139
 Law, in the Mughal Empire, 194-6; digests of Hindu, 195; Muslim,

- adherence of Aurangzeb to, 196; personal, in Mughal India, 197; of succession in Mughal India, 200; of property, changed by Shāh Jahān, 108
- Lilāvatī*, 62
- Liquor, sale of, under Akbar, 31; drinking prohibited by Jahāngīr, 84; prohibited by Shāh Jahān, 121; sale of, under Akbar: Manucci, *Inshā-i-Mūdhorām*, Ovington and Tavernier quoted, 171; Europeans permitted use of wine, 122-3; punishment for sale of, 123
- Lutf Khān, 167
- Maāsir-i-'Ālamgīrī*, account of Aurangzeb's reign, 130; on carrying of arms by Hindus, 150; on the amān of the jizya, 157
- Mahābhārata*, its Persian translation under Akbar, 25
- Mahāish Muhāmmud*, translated into Persian, 62
- Maham Anagā, 15
- Mahdī, Baclāyūnī's belief in the advent of a new, 57
- Mahmūd of Ghazni, his Hindu commanders, 11
- Makhdūm-ul-Mulk, his method of evading payment of tax, 20-1; sale of the Panjab, 34; and the Infallibility Decree, 38-9
- Makhwanā, 188
- Malarium, destruction of a temple at, 141
- Māldev, Raja of Jodhpur, 11, 61
- Malwa, Amīn-i-Jizya, for the province of, 155
- Manavar Beg, sent to destroy Rajput temples, 145
- Manbah, jizya of, 156
- Mandev, in Borar, 156
- Māndhātā of Nurpur, his mansab, 134
- Mān Singh, sent against Pratāp, 17; his governorship, 26; his status, 83; his temples at Bindrabān, 24, 104, 141
- Mān Singh, Jain scholar, 22, 78-9
- Mansabdārs, of Shāh Jahān, 98-102; of Aurangzeb, 131-2; 178-80
- Manucci, on Chahār Taslīm, 96; on the use of wine, 123; on prohibition of *bhāng*, 124; on boards, 125; on Qumir's execution, 126; on the remission of customs duties for the Muslims, 150; on prohibition under Aurangzeb, 171; on the re-imposition of the jizya, 175; on the killing of animals, 112
- Marathas, Jai Singh sent against them, 132; their raids referred to, 158; mansabdārs under Aurangzeb, 133; prisoners converted to Islam, 183-4
- Marriage, of Hindu princess to Akbar, 19; between minors, discouraged by Akbar, 30; between near relatives, discouraged by Akbar, 31; mixed, prohibited by Akbar, 41
- Marwar, temples of, 116-9
- Mary, Queen of England, and Roman Catholicism, 200
- Masūnī, translates *Rāmāyana* into Persian, 86
- Maulānā Muhammad, Mufti of Lahore, 65
- Māyā Dās, Rājī, dismissed by Shāh Jahān, 102
- Maya, temples destroyed at, 148
- Mecca, offerings for, under Shāh Jahān, 96; mission sent to, by Shāh Jahān, 114; pilgrimage to, under Akbar, 42-1
- Memoirs of Bābur*, 62
- Mawar, attacked, 73; temples destroyed by Jahāngīr, 73, 89; contro of Vaiṣṇavism, 142, *see* Udaipur
- Miān Mīr, Muslim saint, 82, 128, 129
- Middle Ages, 8
- Midnapur, destruction of temples at, 138
- Mīnū Bazar, 32
- Mīr Bāqī, 9
- Mīr Halshī, a Shi'a, his execution, 16
- Mīr Hasan, expelled from Kashmir for unorthodox tendencies, 127
- Mīr-i-Haj under Shāh Jahān, 96
- Mīr Juna, his attack on Kuch Bihar, 137
- Mīr Yaqūb, executed as a heretic, 16
- Mirzā Bāqar, censor under Aurangzeb, 124
- Mirzā Jānī, his admission into the Dīn-i-Ilāhī, on

- Mirzā Muqīm, executed as a heretic, 16
- Mission, First Jesuit, 47
- Mitransara, the jurist, 113
- Moham Dās, a diwān under Jahāngir, 81
- Mohan Singh, the temple of, 146
- Monarchy, hereditary in Islam, 199
- Monserrate, carries Akbar's letter to the philosophers of Europe, 47; on Akbar's adherence to Muslim law, 48; on Akbar's religion, 51-2
- Mosques, their alleged conversion into stables by Akbar, 42-3; demolished by Dīn at Ahmednagar, 144-5
- Mu'izzam, governor of Multan, 167
- Mubārak, persecuted, 16; share in Akbar's religious policy, 27; author of the Infallibility Decree, 38, 39; his belief in a Mahdī, 57
- Mughal Emperors, their claims to divine rights, 192-4; Caliphs of God, 192-4; their laws, 194; as despots, 194; as agents of Islam, 199; citizen activities under, 200
- Mughal India, written laws in, 195
- Mughal State, nature of, 191ff.; as a theocracy, 196; limits to its authority, 198-9
- Muhammad, as a part of Akbar's name, 44-5
- Muhammad Ghauṣ, 56
- Muhammad Kāẓim, chronicler of Aurangzeb, 130
- Muhammad Maqbūl Khān Ahmed-ābādī, Sayyid, 87
- Muhammad, Sayyid, asked to translate Qur'ān, 86
- Muhammad, Shaikh, 129
- Muhammad Tahir, beheaded for blasphemy, 127
- Muhammad Tughlaq, 59, 196
- Muhammadans, their part in Hindu festivals, 82
- Muharram, its celebration, 81; stopped by Aurangzeb, 127
- Muhib-Allah, Shaikh, unorthodox ways, 129
- Muhtasib, of Lahore, 65; under Shāh Jahān, 111
- Mullā Ahmad, *see* Ahmad
- Mullādom, Golden Age of, under Aurangzeb, 196, 201; its fall, 20, 22
- Mullā Shāh Ahmad, a Shu'a, 25; a great religious leader, 71
- Mullā Shāh Badakhshī, and Aurangzeb, 128; his commentary on the Qur'ān, 129
- Mullās, their intolerance, 19; their opposition to the patronage of secular literature, 33; their attitude towards shaving, 42; Akbar's support of, 47, 52; on Akbar's delinquencies, 48; excused Zamīnbes by Shāh Jahān, 85
- Mullā Shair, 58
- Mulla, 21, 107; Brahmans punished for imparting education to Muslims at, 139; a Hindu punished at, 150
- Mukand Dās, Rāi, Diwān-i-Tan under Shāh Jahān, 101
- Muntakhib-ul-Lubāb, 130, 134
- Muqarib Khān, alleged conversion, 75-6
- Muradabad, amīn of, 156
- Murray, on Akbar and mosques, 46
- Mūsa, performed prayers at Akbar's court, 43
- Mūsa, 41
- Music, at Shāh Jahān's court, 98; forbidden at court by Aurangzeb, 118
- Muslim, astrologers appointed by Aurangzeb, 120; law, adherence of Aurangzeb to, 196; law of marriage, 41; festivals under Akbar, 44; under Shāh Jahān, 96, 114; political theories, their origin, 199; States, position of non-believers in, 160
- Mustafabad, hot water-springs at, 150
- Mutāh marriages, 19
- Muttra, 83; Akbar at, 24; temples built at, under Jahāngir, 73, 109, 141; temples destroyed by Aurangzeb, 91, 109, 139, 141, 142
- Nagore, 61
- Nāharjī, his son converted to Islam, 109
- Nat-o-Daman, praises of the Prophet in, 50, 62
- Nānak, Guru, 166
- Nānaki, wife of Hargōvind, 187
- Naqshbandia, Muslims, their leader persecuted by Jahāngir, 80

- Naqib Khān, 57
 Narbada, the river, 126
 Nāsir-ud-Dīn Burhānpurī, 86
 Nasrat Jung, 110
 Nathdwara, 142
 Netherlands, 8
 Notoji, conversion to Islam, 162
News Letters, 138; on Aurangzeb, 130; *see* Akhbar-nāh
 New Year, Solar, celebrations by Aurangzeb, 118; parties given by Shāh Jahān, 97
 Nikāh marriages, 19
 Nī'mat Allah, Sayyid, 129
 Nityānanda, his works on Hindu astronomy, 113
 Narpur (Punjab), raja of, 134
 Nūr Ullah, Qāzi, 65; flogged, 80
 Organized church in Ishan, absence of, 197
 Orissa, orders for the destruction of temples in, 137-8, 148
 Ovington, on prostitutes and dancing girls in Surat, 123; on prohibition under Aurangzeb, 171
 Pahunau, Aurangzeb's orders for the conquest of, 137; destruction of temples in, 137; raja of, 162; jizya of, 165
Panchatantra, Persian translation of, 62
 Panipat, second battle of, 15
 Papal nuncio, 12
 Parliament, Cavalier, 169
 Parsis, invited to Akbar's court, 22
 Parvoz, imprisoned, 80
 Payno, his translation of *Guerreroiro*, 75
 Pelsaert, on Muharram, 81
 Persia, Humāyūn's stay in, 10, 47; Shāh 'Abbās Sufavī of, 107
 Persian, Arabic words in, 33, 55
 Personal law in Mughal India, 190
 Peruschi, on Akbar's religious beliefs, 47
 Pilgrimages, to Mecca, under Akbar, 42, 44; under Shāh Jahān, 96; allowed by Jahāngīr, 74
 Pilgrimage tax, under the Sultanate, 2, 3, 7; under Shor Shāh, 11; abolished by Akbar, 23, 24, 40, 70; revived and abolished by Shāh Jahān, 102; reimposed by Aurangzeb, 149
 Pinheiro, on Akbar's religious beliefs, 51-2
 Places of worship, non-Muslims allowed to build, under Jahāngīr, 73
 Portuguese, 55; language, 56; captives, at Surat, 17; on the western coast, 22; Shāh Jahān's quarrel with, 101
Prabodhacandodaya, translated into Persian, 112
 Pratāp, Mahārānā, expedition against, 17
 Pratāp Ujjanya, his rebellion, 109
 Private worship, 3
 Privy Council, 39
 Prophet, The, 41, 42, 41, 47, 50, 58, 127
 Prostitutes, attempts at control by Akbar, 31; laws against, made by Aurangzeb, 123
 Protestants and Protestantism in England, 8, 46, 105, 160, 201; in Ireland, 169
 Public religious worship, under Akbar, 49
 Public Services, 70; under Shāh Jahān, 98; Hindus in, under Jahāngīr, 83; position of Hindus, under the Sultanate, 5; under Akbar, 26, 40; under Jahāngīr, 70, 83; under Shāh Jahān, 98; under Aurangzeb, 129
 Public temples, 23
 Public worship, of Hindu idols, 3; by non-Muslims, under Akbar, 23, 73; places of, 70; under Shāh Jahān, 105; under Aurangzeb, 148
 Panchayats, 195
 Punjab, 21, 34, 106, 107, 166, 168; apostate Hindus of the, 108
 Puraudhar, orders for the destruction of temples at, 147
 Faran Mall, Sher Shāh's treachery towards, 11; defeat of, 12
 Puritanic restrictions, under Aurangzeb, 124ff.
 Pushkar temples, destroyed by Jahāngīr, 89
 Qāduria Muslims, their leader persecuted by Jahāngīr, 80
 Qandahar, 35
 Qāningo, criticized, 11
 Qānungos, appointments on conversion to Islam, 181-3
 Qāzi Husain, 57

- Qumār-ad Dū, suggestion for destruction of temples, 146
- Qumār Khān, 72
- Qumir, beheaded, 126
- Qur'ān, 19, 37, 38, 48, 65, 86, 117, 129, 152
- Qutb-i-'Alam, 44
- Qutb-ul-Mulk of Golconda, 96-7, 114
- Qutub, 72, 89
- Raghunāth Rāi, Imperial Finance Minister under Shāh Jahān, 101; under Aurangzeb, 130, 132, 135
- Rahīm, 87
- Rāi Bihān, 155
- Rāi Singh of Bikanor, 78, 83
- Raja Sangrām, 72
- Rājauri, Hindus of, 72
- Rajput States, *jizya* in, 154
- Rajput War, 123, 135, 144
- Rājūr of Nurpur, 134
- Raj Singh, raja, 110
- Rāj Singh, Rana, 131, 133, 142
- Rājū, a Sayyid heretic, 111
- Rākhi, under Akbar, 20; under Jahāngir, 81
- Rāmāyana*, Persian translation of, 25, 81, 86, 113
- Ramzan, celebrated by Jahāngir, 88
- Rām Nāma*, 86
- Rām Rāi, visit to Aurangzeb, 165, 189; receives jagir from Aurangzeb, 166
- Rām Singh, of Jaipur, 119, 131, 133, 145, 154
- Rām Singh, raja of Kota, 131
- Rana of Chitor, 10
- Rana Sāngā, 9
- Rao Kari, raja of Bikanor, 131
- Rashīd Khān, 125, 158
- Rasulpur, *see* Temples
- Ratan Singh, embraces Islam and is made chief of Rampur, 161-2
- Reconversion to Hinduism, 6
- Reformation in England, 8
- Religious, beliefs, settled in Europe by the State, 201, 202; discussions, Jahāngir's participation in, 82; education, imparting of, 140; fairs and festivals, 2, 70, 81; festivals of Hindus under the Sultanate, 5; toleration by Shāh Jahān, 103; worship, 4, 40; places of non-Muslims, under Shāh Jahān, 103
- Rest-houses, of Shor Shah, 11
- Riot, at Agra, during Holi, 150
- Roe, on Jahāngir's religion, 87
- Roman Catholics, 8, 60, 105, 201
- Royal astrologers dismissed, 120
- Rōz Afzān, son of raja Sangrām, 72
- Sabaumati, Hindus not allowed to cremate their dead on the banks of the, 150
- Sadr-i Jahān, Jahāngir's *sadr-us-sadūr*, 93
- Sadr Jahān, the Grand Mufti, 38-9, 197
- Sadr-us-Sadūr, 'Abdun Nabī, 38-9, 197; seen serving Akbar, 58; under Jahāngir, 88, 93; position of a, 196-7
- Salwaraing tank, 149
- Sālu, Aurangzeb's attempts to convert him, 133, 183
- Sale of children, in the Punjab during famine, 110
- Sale of intoxicants, forbidden by Jahāngir, 84
- Sāluh, Mirza, a Hindu convert, 107
- Salim, 17, 48, 66, 89
- Salim Shāh, 12
- Salutation balcony, used by Shāh Jahān, 97
- Sambhal, 9
- Samugarh, battle of, referred to, 165
- Sangar, 82
- Sankar, sent to demolish temples at Sheogaon, 147
- Sanskrit works, translated into Persian under Shāh Jahān, 112; writers of, 113
- Sarda Act, 31
- Sardul Singh, temples set up in the house of, 146
- Sarnad, persecuted by Aurangzeb, 127-8
- Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, on Holi under Aurangzeb, 149; on the remission of *jizya*, 158
- Sarup Singh, raja of Bikaner, 131
- Satara, Khāndā Rāi temple at, 104
- Sati, under Akbar, 30; British attempts to restrict it, 31; stopped by Jahāngir, 84; *see* Aurangzeb; extent of, under Aurangzeb, 172
- Satrunjaya, Jain temples of, 24
- Sayyids, 18; rulers of Delhi, 168
- Sayyid Muhammad, 20

- Schools, of the Hindus destroyed, 140
- Shah-i-Barāt, 81, 96
- Shādmān, a poet, 129
- Shāh 'Alam ordered to persecute Sikhs, 168
- Shāh Jahān, excuses scholars from *ajida*, 36; uses title of 'Khalīfat Ullah', 55; his rebellion, 66, 89; governor of Gujarat, 79; reputed follower of Ahmad Sirhindh, 80; charged with poisoning Jahāngīr, 91; destroys temple at Uchhah, 91; as an orthodox Muslim, 94; his accession, 94; and Muslim festivals, 96; and Afghan heretical practices, 97; and his Hindu *mansabdārs*, 99, 100, 101; *jizya* and pilgrimage tax under, 102; status of Hindus under, 102; temples, 102; and his religious toleration, 103; influence of Dārā on, 104; his interference with open public worship, 105; return from Kashmir, 106; and Muslim prisoners of war, 107; conversions to Islam, 108; prohibits sale of wine, 111; appoints *mudlatīs*, 111; sumptuary laws and law of blasphemy under, 111; Sanskrit writers under him, 113; patronises Hindu poets, 113; patronises dancing, music, painting and astrology, 114; sends mission to Mecca, 114; references to, 115, 127; prohibits use of wine, 121; and the Hindus in the public services, 129-30; and Hindu temples referred to, 135; Muttra temples referred to, 139; claims to Divine rights, 192, 193, 194; as guardian of Islam, 199
- Shāhji Sayyid, Khoja leader, ordered to the court by Aurangzeb, 126
- Shāhji, taken into Imperial service by Shāh Jahān, 101-2
- Shāh Muhammad, 12
- Shāh Shujā', 129
- Shaikh 'Alī Ahmad, 57
- Shaikh Gadāī, a Shi'a *sadr-us-sadr*, 18
- Shaikh-ul-Islām, a *sadr-us-sadr* of Aurangzeb, 146
- Shaikh Farīd, 71
- Shaikh Pir, 88
- Shaikh Zain, 9
- Shaikh-i-Kāmil, 57
- Sharif 'Amil, 57
- Shaukar, a ruler, 109
- Sher Shāh Sūrī and Hindus, 10; his religious policy, 11-12
- Shoogoon, *see* Sankar
- Shi'as, 10, 16, 18, 19, 16, 56
- Shivājī, 132; alleged protest against *jizya*, 153
- Shivacātri, under Akbar, 29; celebrated under Jahāngīr, 82
- Shujā', governor of Kabul, 109
- Sihar, village of, 112
- Sijda*, under Shāh Jahān, 36; under Akbar, 95; under Jahāngīr, 85, 95; *see* Zamīnbas; under Akbar, Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān, 136
- Sikandar Shāh, 12
- Sikandar Lodi, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11
- Sikandar Butākhān, 7
- Sikhs, and Aurangzeb, 165ff., 188ff.; in the Punjab, Jahāngīr's attempt to crush them, 78; persecution of, under Aurangzeb, 176-7; attack on the Emperor, 167; their relations with Jahāngīr, 76; their religious leader released by Jahāngīr, 77; Guru Hargovind, 107; temples demolished and converted into mosques, 147-8; temples destroyed at Sirhind, 167
- Silver plate removed from the court, 120-1
- Sind, 35; Brahmans punished for imparting religious education, 139; Arab conquest of, referred to, 152
- Singers of Kashmir, 125
- Sirhind, 49, 57, 81, 108, 147, 167; *see* Sikhs
- Slave rulers of Delhi, 168
- Slaughter of animals, not allowed twice a week by Akbar and Jahāngīr, 85; under Jahāngīr, 85; Shāh Jahān's attitude towards, 122; Akbar and Jahāngīr's attitudes referred to, 112
- Smith, Dr Vincent, on Akbar's religious policy, 41; criticized, 41, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52
- Sobhā Chand, Rāi, *diwān* of Lahore under Shāh Jahān, 101
- Social evils, suppression by Jahāngīr, 84
- Solar New Year, celebrations by Persian kings, 118

Somesvara, temple of, 144
 Somnath, temple destroyed, 137
 Somnath, destruction of temples at, 147
 Srinagar, 128
 Sri Ranga III, of the Carnatic, attacked by 'Adil Khān, 110
 Stamp duties, 9
 State religion, 52
 Succession, troubles under the Mughal emperors about, 200, 201
 Sūfis, 28
 Sūfi, traditions, 71; thought, 83
 Sujān Rāi, on the revenues of Berar, 150
 Sultānate, 1, 5, 7
 Sultān Khwāja, 34
 Sultān Muhammad, reprimanded by Aurangzeb, 125
 Sultānpur, 44
 Sumptuary laws under Sultans, 6
 Sunder Dās, a Hindu poet at Shāh Jahān's court, 113
 Sūnnis, appointment of amāms by Aurangzeb, 126
 Superintendent of converts, appointed by Shāh Jahān, 108
 Supremacy, Act of, 202
 Sūrāj Mall, 134
 Surat, 17, 26, 44, 81; Hindus of, 143; threatened migration to Bombay for fear of conversion, deputation to the Emperor, 163; Resident and Council of, 163
 Sūrāt Singh, son of Guru Har-govind, 188
 Sūr Dās, patronized by Jahāngir, 87
 Sūr Sāgar, poetry by Sūr Dās, 87

Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, 57
 Tāj-ud-Dīn of Delhi, 37, 57
 Tarbenī, wife of Guru Har Rāi, 189
Tārīkh-i-Dāudī, on Sher Shāh, 11
Tārīkh-i-Haqī, on Akbar, 57
 Taslim, introduced by Hunāyūn, 36
 Tauhid-i-Ilāhī, 51; see Dīn-i-Ilāhī
 Tavernier, on motives for conversion, 163; on prohibition under Aurangzeb, 171
 Tegh Bahādur, Guru, his selection as a guru, 166, 189; execution by Aurangzeb, 166, 189
 Temple, of Bindrabān, 24; of Jwalā Mukhī, 24; built at Thanesar under Akbar, 45; at Jodhpur, 11; of Khandai Rāi at Chintāman, 104; of Malarina, 141; of Muttra,

destroyed by Aurangzeb, 91; at Sambhal converted into a mosque, 9; of Vishwa Nath, 141; of Sikhs at Sirhind, 167
 Temples, built at Muttra, Benares, under Jahāngir, 73; destroyed at Kangra and Ajmer under Jahāngir, 73, 89; in Palamau under Aurangzeb, 137; in Gujarat, Orissa and Kuch Bihar, 137; in Benares, Allahabad, Kashmir and Kangra by Shāh Jahān, 103; at Karor, Amber, Jaipur, Lakheri, 145; at Ahmadabad by Shāh Jahān, 104; by Aurangzeb, 140ff.; at Jaipur by Aurangzeb, 145; in Hyderabad, 146; in Rasulpur, 146; at Sheogoon, Jai Singh Pura, Sorath, Parandhar, Wakenkora, Udaipur, Bundel Khund, Ghayaspur, 147; at Ayodhya, Hardwar, Kedarpur, Maharashtra, 148; at Tilkuti, orders for destruction, 138; building of new ones and repairs stopped by Shāh Jahān, 103; by Aurangzeb, 137-8; at Benares, Aurangzeb's orders, 136; Aurangzeb's orders for destruction of temples at Muttra, 139; destruction of temples, see Jahāngir, Shāh Jahān, Aurangzeb, Gujarat, Ghayas Pur, Haitheswar, Hardwar, Kedarpur, Karor, Lakheri, Midnapur
 Thanesar, temple built at, 45
 Thatta, church at, 24
 Theocratic nature of the Mughal State, 196
 Theologians, serving as officials, 67; at Jahāngir's court, 85; and the reimposition of the jizya under Aurangzeb, 175; and Aurangzeb, 203
 Thirty-Nine Articles, 40, 201
 Three Missions, 52
 Tibet, 107
 Tilkuti, see Temples
 Tika, see Aurangzeb; and Shāh Jahān, 98
 Tirupati, temple allowed to stand, 143
 Todor Mall, Rai, 101
 Todor Mall, raja, 26, 27, 62, 83
 Toleration, religious, discussed, 169
 Tombs of saints, lights prohibited by Aurangzeb, 126

- Translation Department, organized by Akbar, 25
 Trial by ordeal, under Akbar, 32
 Tughlaqs, 18; rulers of Delhi, 168
 Tulūdān, 36; discontinued by Aurangzeb, 119
 Turan, 48
- Udai Bhān, conversion, 109
 Udaipur, 134, 142; ruler of, 131, 133; in Bundelkhand, 147; temples destroyed in the Rajput War, 144
 Udaī Sāgar, temples destroyed at, 144
 Udaī Singh of Jodhpur, 63
 Udāsīs, their quarrel with Muslims, 188
 Ujjain, 83
 Ujjain, Jain temples of, 24; attempts to destroy temples in the area of, 143
 Ullah Dād, Mullā, of Sirhind, 57
 Uniformity, Act of, 40
Upanishads, translated into Persian under Shāh Jahān, 112
 Ureliha, *see* Temples
 Urva, 9
 Uzbek, 'Abdulla Khān, 47
- Vaishnavas, 83
 Vodāngarāja, a protego of Shāh Jahān, 113
 Vedāntist school of Hindu philosophy, 71
 Vedāntism, compared with Sufism, 83
- Vikramājīt, Raja, governor of Gujarat, 83
 Village fairs, 3
 Vincent Smith, *see* Smith
 Von Noer, 53
 Vukla-i-Sharā', under Aurangzeb, 198
- Wajāh-ud-Dīn, 82
 War of Succession, 102, 130, 165
 Weighing of the Emperor, under Jahāngīr, 84; as a protective measure, 84, 85
 Widows, remarriage allowed by Akbar, 30
 Wine, selling, public or private stopped, 111; sale of, stopped by Jahāngīr, 84; preparation in public and sale prohibited by Shāh Jahān; wine sellers punished under Aurangzeb, prohibitions enforced by the censor, 121
 Withington, 74
- Yahya (Christi), Shaikh, saint of Ahmadabad, 124
Yoga Vāsīṣṭha, translated into Persian under Shāh Jahān, 112
- Zain-ul-'Ābidīn, ruler of Kashmir, 2, 7
 Zamīnbos, 95
 Zinab, convert, 106
 Zoroastrian priests, 50
 Zoroastrianism, 54
 Zulqarneyn, an Armonian Christian, 72

